

THE
QUARTERLY REVIEW
OF
THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH.

OCTOBER, 1883.

ARTICLE I.
OF FREE WILL.*

AUGSBURG CONFESSION, ARTICLE XVIII.

By PROF. H. LOUIS BAUGHER, D. D., Gettysburg, Pa.

The Article of the Augsburg Confession coming next in the regular order in which the several articles have been discussed on the Holman foundation, is the eighteenth—"De Libero Arbitrio," or "Of Free Will." It reads as follows:

"Concerning free will they teach, that the human will possesses some liberty for the performance of civil duties, and for the choice of those things subject to reason. But it does not possess the power, without the influence of the Holy Spirit, of fulfilling the righteousness of God, or spiritual righteousness: for the natural man receiveth not the things which are of the Spirit of God: but this is accomplished in the heart, when the Holy Spirit is received through the word. The same is declared by Augustine in so many words: 'We confess that all men have a free will, which possesses the judgment of reason, by which they cannot indeed, without the divine aid, either begin or certainly accomplish what is becoming in things relating to God; but only in works of the present life, as well good as evil.

*Holman Lecture on the Augsburg Confession for 1883, delivered in the Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa., June 22, 1883.

In good works, I say, which arise from our natural goodness, such as to choose to labor in the field, to eat and drink, to choose to have a friend, to have clothing, to build a house, to take a wife, to feed cattle, to learn various and useful arts, or to do any good thing relative to this life; all which things, however, do not exist without the divine government; yea, they exist and begin to be from Him and through Him. And in evil works (men have a free will), such as to choose to worship an idol, to will to commit murder, etc.*

"They condemn the Pelagians, and others, who teach that we are able, by the mere powers of nature, without the aid of the Holy Spirit, to love God above all things, and to do his commands, as to the substance of our actions. For, although nature may be able, after a certain manner, to perform external actions, such as to abstain from theft, from murder, etc., yet it cannot perform the inner motions, such as the fear of God, faith in God, chastity, patience, etc."*

*We give the translation found in the Book of Worship. The original, in German and Latin (Müller, Symb. Bücher), is as follows:

Vom freien Willen wird gelehret, dass der Mensch etlichermassen einen freien Willen hat äusserlich ehrbar zu leben und zu wählen unter denen Dingen, so die Vernunft begreift; aber ohne Gnad, Hilfe und Wirkung des heiligen Geistes vermag der Mensch nicht Gott gefällig werden, Gott herzlich zu fürchten, oder zu gläuben, oder die angeborne böse Lust aus dem Herzen zu werfen; sondern solchs geschicht durch den heiligen Geist, welcher durch Gottes Wort gegeben wird. Denn Paulus spricht 1. Kor. 2: 14. Der natürliche Mensch vernimmt nichts vom Geist Gottes.

Und damit man erkennen möge, dass hierin kein Neugkeit gelehrt werde, so sind das die klaren Wort Augustini vom freien Willen, wie jetzund hiebei geschrieben aus dem 3. Buch Hypognosticon: "Wir bekennen, dass in allen Menschen ein freier Wille ist, denn sie haben je alle natürlichen, angebornen Verstand und Vernunft, nicht dass sie

De libero arbitrio docent, quod humana voluntas habeat aliquam libertatem ad efficiendam civilem iustitiam et deligendas res rationi subiectas. Sed non habet vim sine Spiritu Sancto efficiendae iustitiae Dei seu iustitiae spiritualis, quia animalis homo non percipit ea, quae sunt Spiritus Dei; sed haec fit in cordibus, quum per verbum Spiritus Sanctus concipitur. Haec totidem verbis dicit Augustinus lib. III. Hypognosticon: "*Esse fatemur liberum arbitrium omnibus hominibus, habens quidem iudicium rationis, non per quod sit idoneum in iis, quae ad Deum pertinent, sine Deo aut inchoare aut certe peragere, sed tantum in operibus vitae praesentis tam bonis quam etiam malis. Bonis dico, quae de bono naturae oriuntur, id est velle laborare in agro, velle manducare et bibere, velle habere amicum velle habere indumenta, velle fabricare domum, uxorem velle ducere, pecora nutrire, artem discere diversarum rerum bonarum, vel*

DEFINITION.

Although here as elsewhere the Confessors avoid all mere philosophy, looking at the subject merely from a religious standpoint, yet it may not be amiss for us, before entering directly on a consideration of what they say on this a pre-eminently philosophical subject, to seek some clear definition of the subject itself, even though we go to the philosophers for it. What is the Will? and what is the Freedom of the Will? Writers on the Human Mind with general consent arrange its functions into the threefold division of The Intellect, The Sensibilities, and The Will, or the mind knowing or reasoning, the mind feeling, and the mind willing. These are but functions or acts of the one indivisible mind. The Will is that in man which is causal and constitutes more than anything else his personality. He *has* reason and consciousness, intelligence and desire; but when he puts forth a volition he declares himself and becomes conscious that he *is*, and of what he is!

There is in man a *nature*-basis, by which he is a part of that which we call Nature: and nature is determined by the fixed laws that govern it and is, therefore, not in any sense free. But there is in man also a *personal* basis, whereby he is distinguished from nature, whereby he knows himself to be a moral being, having in himself a power of causation, which is free from outward compulsion, free from the fixedness of natural law, and in

etwas vermögen mit Gott zu handeln, als: Gott von Herzen zu lieben, zu fürchten, sondern allein in äusserlichen Werken dieses Lebens haben sie Freiheit guts oder böses zu wählen. Gut mein ich, das die Natur vermag, als auf dem Acker zu arbeiten oder nicht, zu essen, zu trinken, zu einem Freunde zu gehen oder nicht, ein Kleid an oder auszuthun, zu bauen, ein Weib zu nehmen, ein Handwerk zu treiben und dergleichen etwas nützlich und guts zu thun. Welches alles doch ohne Gott nicht ist noch bestehet, sondern alles aus ihm und durch ihn ist. Dagegen kann der Mensch auch böses aus eigener Wahl fürnehmen, als für einem Abgott nieder zu knien, ein Todtschlag zu thun, etc."

quidquid bonum ad praesentem pertinet vitam. Quae omnia non sine divino gubernaculo subsistunt, imo ex ipso et per ipsum sunt et esse coeperunt. Malis vero dico, ut est velle idololum colere, velle homicidium cet."

Damnatio Pelagianos et alios, qui docent, quod sine Spiritu Sancto solis naturae viribus possimus Deum super omnia diligere, item praecepta Dei facere quoad substantiam actuum. Quamquam enim externa opera aliquo modo efficere natura possit (potest enim continere manus a furto, a caede), tamen interiores motus non potest efficere, ut timorem Dei, fiduciam erga Deum, castitatem, patientiam cet.

the exercise of which he is conscious of moral responsibility, of right and wrong.

"Every man is conscious," says Dr. Reid, "of a power to determine in things which he conceives to depend upon his determination. To this power we give the name of *will*."

Carpenter calls the Will, "A self-determining power within us."

Liebmann says, "Will is the function of the Ego by which it determines itself to action."

Bouillet calls it, "The faculty of willing, of self-determining;" and says, "It differs from desire and from the understanding; it ought to control the former and receive illumination from the latter."

Tappan says, "Will is employed to express the causality of the mind," is "the power by which we determine personal acts," and, in view of its essential connection with intelligence, calls it, "A power of rational self-determination."

Many of you will recall President Valentine's definition, that "The Will is the soul's power of causality for choices."

The very idea of the Will involves the idea of a certain freedom or liberty possessed by it. The question before us involves the extent of this liberty. The two things are so inseparably connected as to be defined together by philosophers. Thus Kant says, "Everything in nature works according to laws. A rational being alone has the faculty of acting in accordance with conception of laws, principles, *i. e.* has a *will*. As reason is required that we may deduce action from laws, the will is nothing more than practical reason. If the will be in itself in complete conformity with reason, it is the faculty of choosing that only which the reason recognizes as good; in opposition to this, the determination of the will is necessitation. A perfectly good will cannot be conceived of as *necessitated* to actions in conformity with law. Hence, for the will of God, and for a holy will in general, there can be no imperatives. The *shall* is out of place, the *will* is of itself in necessary harmony with law." Again, he says, "Will is that kind of causality attributed to living agents, in so far as they are possessed of reason; and free-

dom is such a property of that causality as enable them to originate events independently of foreign determining causes."

I. H. Fichte says, "Liberty, in its highest sense, can be attributed to that only which is through itself everything that it is. There can be nothing freely willed which does not in some degree express the essential nature of him who wills. To be free is to determine ourselves; knowing, feeling and willing in accordance with our individual nature."

K. Ph. Fischer says, "All actual liberty of the subject willing, is a making of oneself free, and as the will can be nothing which it is not in itself, this essential liberty must be the presupposition of our becoming subjectively free; and the self-freeing of a subject willing, is nothing more than making itself that for which it was created."

Hegel says, "Liberty lies in the indetermination of the will; it has in it no determination produced by nature; it has itself only as object and contents; it refers itself only to itself; it is the faculty of reflective self-determination."

Schelling says, "Liberty is not a totally fortuitous occurrence of actions, nor are these actions determined by empirical necessity; rather it consists in a loftier necessity, whose spring is the essential nature of him who acts. That only is free which acts in accordance with the laws of its own essential nature, and thus results of necessity," (*i. e.* a necessity of *certainty*). "It is the faculty of the good and of the evil."

Ulrici says, "Liberty is the consciousness of the ability to decide differently, to act differently. The human will as the power of self-manifestation, self-assertion, and self-determination, is simply the highest grade of that spontaneity which pertains to every human being. In the consciousness of itself it is exalted to the consciousness of liberty. We impute to ourselves, in our consciousness, liberty of willing. The impulses which operate on our wills present themselves to our consciousness not as coercive causes, but are rendered motives by the soul itself. Thus our willing and acting are to our consciousness free."

Zeller says, "To determine oneself means that we have in our Self, in the Ego, in the personality as such, the ground of the specific action which is determined."

Again, Freedom of the Will has been, briefly but somewhat loosely, defined to be, "Power to the contrary."

In looking over the many definitions and statements of philosophers we are impressed with the fact that there is, to say the least, as much difference among them in reference to the same subjects, and as much contradiction of themselves and of one another, as ever has existed among or been alleged against the much abused theologians and dogmaticians.

Stewart vs. Reed seems to acknowledge that in certain respects the problem we are considering is beyond the capacity of human thought, and to admit that all reasoning for, as all reasoning against, our liberty, is on this account invalid.

Yet it would not do thus to dismiss a practical question of such importance that its determination affects the whole subject of Anthropology.

The question of Free Will is not concerning man in his original state before the fall, nor after regeneration, nor after the resurrection; but only concerning his fallen state before regeneration. How was man's will affected by the fall? How were his powers as a self-determining moral agent affected? "What powers in spiritual things he has from himself, since the fall of our first parents, and before regeneration, and whether, from his own powers, before he has been born again by God's Spirit, he be able to dispose and prepare himself for God's grace, and to accept or not the grace offered through the Holy Ghost in the word and holy sacraments?"*

THE HISTORY OF THE DISCUSSION OF THIS QUESTION.

During the first three centuries after the closing of the New Testament Canon the doctrines of sin and grace, in their more difficult and scientific aspects, did not seriously engage the attention of the Church. As a natural consequence of her polemic attitude towards the fatalism of Paganism and the denial of responsibility by Gnosticism, the anthropology of the period was marked by a strong emphasis of the doctrine of human freedom. This was particularly manifest in the Alexandrian

*Form. Conc. Part I, chap ii.

and Antiochian schools, and became the general type of doctrine for the Eastern Church. In the Western Church, led by Tertullian, Cyprian, Hilary and Ambrose, a contrary tendency manifested itself and grew, until the two opposite predominant tendencies ran into two great dogmatic divisions, which exist until to-day. In respect to that early period they were known respectively as the Greek Anthropology and the Latin Anthropology. The former virtually denied original sin, made the fall to affect only the corporeal and sensuous nature, but not the rational and voluntary, and was synergistic in its view of regeneration. The latter held original sin to be voluntary, as being self-will, and, therefore, a matter of guilt, that the Adamic connection relates to the entire man, the voluntary and rational as well as the corporeal and sensuous, and the will is corrupted as well as the other parts of his nature, and that the corruption of the sensuous nature is consequent upon, and not antecedent to, the apostasy of the rational and voluntary nature of man. The Latin Church was also monergistic in its view of regeneration, holding the human will to be, up to that point, hostile to God and therefore not co-operating with him.*

The Pelagian controversy of the fifth century furnished occasion for a thorough and animated discussion of the subject of Free Will; and, since the condemnatory clause of our Article puts the Pelagians and those who may be classed with them under the ban, we may as well, right here, consider the points of that controversy, which will lead us to examine first the negative side of the views and statement of the Confessors.

THE PELAGIAN CONTROVERSY.

The man whose name is inseparably connected with this controversy and gave it origin was Pelagius, a British monk of honest and good intentions, who, seeing so much of that so-called faith of which St. James speaks, which is divorced from works, and finding men who used the doctrine of human corruption and free grace to excuse their own sins, thought to correct these evils by preaching a rigorous morality and stimulating

*Cf. Shedd's *Hist. of Doc.*, Vol. I., chap. ix.

men thereto by exalting their merely human powers, setting forth possibilities in the spiritual realm of which he represented them to be capable by the powers of their own will and a culture of their own faculties.

Pelagius' leading opponent was the great Augustine, of North Africa. Between these two persons and their experiences, there was as great a difference as between the opposing systems to which each has given his name. Pelagius is represented as a man of cold, passionless nature, who lived a quiet, cloister life, unshaken by conflicts from without or within. Augustine, as is well known, was a man of ardent temperament and during the early period of his life was in bondage to strong corrupt passion. He passed through the throes of intense conflict of flesh and spirit before he arrived at peace with conscience and with God, and an experience of that renovating power, requisite to a holy life, of which he felt the need. Like Luther his anthropology was born of his own innermost experience. He had himself been in the depths of human depravity, and knew himself to be utterly unable of himself to get out of the horrible pit. He had experienced in himself the power of divine grace as able to save unto the uttermost. He found in himself nothing, morally and spiritually, to commend or hang a hope upon: he found in the treasures of divine grace a fulness that satisfied all his needs. His system is found in miniature in his own experience, and is deep and rich: whereas Pelagius, devoid of a rich inward Christian experience, misconceived the true spiritual nature of holiness and sanctification, and his most serious religious teaching never went beyond the exhortation to live a sober and virtuous life: and his system is correspondingly superficial, and perhaps for this reason more acceptable to the natural heart.

The deepest ground of the difference between Pelagianism and Augustinianism lies in their respective views of the relation between the Creator and the creation, the former looking upon the creature as at first endowed by the Creator with sufficient powers and faculties and then left to itself to develop itself independently of God, whereas the latter viewed the creature as entirely and always dependent on the Creator, as much for the

continuance and development of its powers and faculties as originally for their gift. Augustine called the relation of man to God even before the fall, and that of the pure spirits in heaven, by the term *gratia*. As the eye is circumstanced to the light of the sun, so is the created spirit to the grace of God. Pelagius said, "That the eye can see is the gift of God; whether it sees well or ill depends on ourselves." In reference to goodness, he distinguished a *posse*, a *velle*, and an *esse*. The *posse* is the gift of God; the *velle* and *esse* are to be referred to man as proceeding from his will. All moral character, then, comes from the use man makes of his powers. Pelagius held that man has the ability, at every moment, of doing good or evil; that his will is, as before the fall, in moral equilibrium, which is broken by his choice in every case. This gives an atomistic theory of character; it is made to consist in acts or the expression, and not at all in the *habitus* or condition. The fruit itself is made the character of the tree instead of an expression of the character inherent in the root and sap, the trunk and leaf.

Pelagius held that our first parents stood only for themselves and that their sin did not affect the race except by the power of example. Men are corrupt through constant habit of evil, not by nature. They still have the same natural powers of holiness that Adam had. There have been those, Pelagius said, who have lived without sin, among his list of whom he mentions Abel, John the Baptist, and Mary, the Lord's mother. The Pelagians appealed to the virtues of the heathen, as evidences of the moral powers of unaided human nature. Indeed the whole Pelagian system resolved itself into nothing more than natural religion.

It is such teachings—"that we are able, by the mere powers of nature, without the aid of the Holy Spirit, to love God above all things, and to do his commands, as to the substance of our actions"—that the Augsburg Confessors "condemn."

"In the system of Pelagius," says Baur, "everything depends upon the principle of the freedom of the will, this is the determining and fundamental conception in his doctrine of sin and

of grace. Freedom, as the absolute capacity of choice (*liberum arbitrium*) to determine equally for good or evil, appeared to him in such a degree to be the substantial good of human nature, that he even reckoned the capacity for evil as a *bonum naturae*, since we cannot choose good without in like manner being able to choose evil." We are reminded here of Eve's argument with herself before the forbidden tree—she saw that it was "a tree to be desired to make one wise," and of Satan's persuasion that by eating of it they would know both "good and evil."

Augustine, on the contrary held that state of mind in which it is no longer necessary to choose between good and evil, the being free from sin, to be the true freedom, and in his treatise *De Civit. Dei*. xiv. 11, which was not written against the Pelagians, says, "The will, therefore, is then truly free, when it does not serve vices and sins. Such it was given by God; and, having been lost by man's own vice, it cannot be restored, unless by Him who was able to give it. Whence The Truth says 'If the Son shall make you free, then shall ye be free indeed.' But this is the very same as if He should say, If the Son save you, then shall ye be truly saved. Whence, forsooth, He is the Liberator, the Saviour."

Such a thing as a *characterless* will, a *liberum indifferentiae*, in equilibrium between choices good or ill,—such as Pelagius ascribed to man—Augustine regarded as an impossibility, contrary to the very nature of the faculty called will, and in this he is fully sustained by the philosophers. Power to the contrary, in either direction (of good or evil), he considered only an accident and not the substance of voluntariness. "Voluntariness consists in positively willing the one thing that is willed, and not in the bare possibility of willing a contrary thing. If a person walk by his own self-decision, this decision would be neither strengthened nor weakened by endowing him with another power to fly. His voluntariness depends upon the single fact that he is walking without external compulsion, and of his own accord." "The power of contrary choice, according to the Augustinian anthropology, can be given in only one direction"—that is, in the downward direction of sin. "It is a transient

and accidental characteristic of the human will, which is intended to belong to it only during the middle or probationary stage in its history, and which disappears either in a state of immutable holiness or immutable sin."

"Even when the power to the contrary, or the *possibilitas peccandi*, is given for purposes of probation, the real freedom of the will, according to Augustine, is seen in *not* using it, rather than in using it,—in continuing to will the right, and refusing to will the wrong. Persistency in the existing determination, and not a capricious departure into another determination, is the token of true rational liberty. "Velle et nolle, propriae voluntatis est,—by which Augustine means that to will holiness and to nill sin, not to will *either* holiness or sin, is the characteristic of the will." On the other hand what the Latin anthropology made the accident of moral freedom the Greek anthropology made its substance, holding it "not sufficient that the will be uncompelled and self-moved. It must possess, over and above this, a power of alternative choice,—the *possibilitas utriusque partis*. Hence the human will, by creation and structure, is indifferent and undetermined. Having no choice by and at creation, it can choose with equal facility either of the two contraries, holiness or sin. And in *this* fact, and not in its positive self-motion, consists its freedom."*

Here we see an important difference between the two tendencies as to the very nature of the will, and, consequently, in their conceptions of moral freedom. This has tended to confusion in the discussion.

In the Pelagian controversy the doctrine concerning Grace naturally came in for as much discussion as that of Free Will: and generally Liberty and Grace are the co-ordinate parts of one and the same discussion. In the Pelagian system there would seem to be no room for grace, in the usual scripture sense of the term. For if children are now born with uncorrupted powers, equal to those of our first parents, and if, even after sins committed, their faculties are so unimpaired that every moment they have power to choose the good or the evil, their probation

*Shedd: Hist. Doc., Vol. I., 3. §3.

also is like that of our first parents, into which grace, in the evangelical sense did not enter. If man is sufficient of himself, what expectation or need of grace?

However they did not carry out their principles to this extent, but contended, sometimes stoutly, for the necessity of grace as an assistant to nature. Pelagius asserted that God's grace enabled men to accomplish more easily what they ought to accomplish by their free will, and admitted various stages in the divine education of humanity correspondent to its progressive deterioration. But, as the two systems differed in their idea of freedom, so it was in respect to grace. The Pelagian view was indefinite and superficial, and was always an external communication, something foreign, and not, as Augustine viewed it, an impartation of divine life through Christ. Christ's work was *educational*. He promulgated a new and higher law, presented new motives to virtue, and gave a perfect example.* But men did not need a Redeemer, since they were not sold under sin, in moral bondage; nor to be born again of the Holy Spirit and renewed into the divine life of Christ, for they were not by nature morally dead.

Wiggers compares the three systems with each other as follows: Augustinianism asserts that man is morally *dead*; Semi-Pelagianism maintains that he is morally *sick*; Pelagianism holds that he is morally *well*.—And they that be whole need not a physician. But the dead need to be raised, if they are to live, need to be born again (or from above) by the new-creating Spirit of God.

Augustine, in his theory of regeneration, distinguished three stages of grace: *gratia praeveniens* or *praeprans*, which, without any efficiency of man's powers, working sovereignly, illumines the understanding, arouses the sensibilities and leads man to faith, herein setting free the enslaved will: then follows *gratia operans*, or grace working the divine life in the soul, establishing it in a peaceful sense of justification and acceptance with God, confirming the liberated will in choosing God and goodness: finally, *gratia coöperans*, in which the will of man is

*See Neander's Hist. Christ. Dogmas, Vol. II. (Translated by Ryland, Bohn's Library.)

brought into entire harmony with God and a perfection is attained characterized by impossibility of sinning (*non posse peccare*), which Augustine regarded as the *real* freedom, and which is realized only in the future state.

In solving the problem how it comes that grace is effective in some persons and fruitless in others, Augustine argued that as man is at first, through the bondage of his will, unable to do any thing toward his own regeneration, is dead, the reason of the difference cannot be referred to man, every individual person being equally unable. Therefore it must be referred to God, who works in man of his own good pleasure; and, accordingly, Augustine resorted, for explanation, to the Divine Sovereignty and to a Decree of unconditional Predestination, whereby some are elected, irrespective of God's foreknowledge concerning them, to everlasting life, begun in regeneration and carried on by grace, whilst all others are left to their sinful selves without any attempt at recovery on God's part. His doctrine doomed even infants to hell. It was reactionary against the severity of this doctrine of absolute Predestination that the Semi-Pelagian theories arose, which attempted to take a middle ground between Pelagianism and Augustinianism. They conditioned the efficiency of divine grace in the individual upon an internal reciprocity and susceptibility on his part. At the head of the Semi-Pelagian party was John Cassian and his views may serve to represent the tendency.

Free Will, he held, and Grace agreed, and hence there was an opposing onesidedness which maintained either Grace alone or Free Will alone. Augustine and Pelagius were each wrong in their own way. The idea of the Divine justice in the determination of man's lot after the first transgression did not preponderate in Cassian's writings as in Augustine's, but the idea of a disciplinary divine love, by the leadings of which men are to be led to repentance. He appeals also to the mysteriousness of God's ways, not as concerns predestination, but the variety of leadings by which God leads different individuals to salvation. Nor is one law applicable to all; in some cases Grace anticipates (*gratia praeveniens*), in others a conflict precedes and then divine help comes to them as Grace. In no instance can

divine Grace operate independently of the free Self-determination of Man. As the husbandman must do his part, but all this avails nothing without the divine blessing, so man must do his part, yet this profits nothing without divine grace.*

Another Semi-Pelagian leader, Faustus, in a presentation of the pure doctrine, compares the contrast of Freedom and Grace with that of the divine and human in the person of Christ; as in that its peculiar qualities are to be attributed to each nature, so in man we must distinguish what proceeds from the grace of God and what is of man. The Free Will must not be regarded as annihilated, but it belongs to man to regain the divine favor by his own exertions and God's help. A spark is placed within him which it behooves him to cherish by the help of grace.

Before the close of the fifth century Augustinianism had triumphed in the Western Church as the orthodox doctrine, though not without leaving in many individuals therein the seeds of the contrary doctrine. The leaders of the Eastern Church kept up a decided opposition to Pelagianism, yet the former tendency, toward confidence in the natural human powers, still characterized it.

In the middle ages Semi-Pelagianism gradually supplanted Augustinianism even where the latter had been before triumphant, and though supported by Gottschalk, Bede, Anselm, Bernard, and most of the schoolmen, until finally it was by the Council of Trent formally stated as the Papal doctrine.

Chemnitz† in his review of this Council expresses the opinion that such doctrines (Semi-Pelagianism) are condemned by the *language* of the decrees, but quotes the expositor of the Council to the effect that said decrees were composed with such ingenuity as to declare nothing positively, and to leave men on the fence of this controversy, free to get down on either side.

Bellarmin,‡ the great Romish expositor, represents man as created in *puris naturalibus*—which is very much like Pelagius' *non pleni nascimur*—and that the condition of man in *puris naturalibus* differed from his condition after the fall only as

*Neander: Hist. Christ. Dogmas, Vol. II.

†Examen Conc. Trid., Pars I., locus iii., §1, cap. 1.

‡De Controversiis, iv. 15, vi. 10.

that of a naked person from one who had been stripped of his clothes. For, in the papal view original righteousness was not inherent in man's nature but was a supernatural endowment ; and, accordingly, the corruption of human nature consists not in an inherent defect, but in the loss of supernatural gifts.

"Holding such views of original sin," says Shedd, "it was logical that the Tridentine theologians should combat the doctrine of human impotence, and the helpless dependence of the apostate will upon the Divine efficiency in order to its renewal. They adopt the theory of synergism in regeneration, and defend it with great earnestness."

"If any one," say the Tridentine Canons, "shall affirm that the free will of man was lost, and became extinct, after the sin of Adam * * let him be accursed. If any one shall affirm that the free will of man, moved and excited by God, co-operates nothing by assenting to God thus exciting and calling, so that it *disposes and prepares itself* for obtaining the grace of justification, but like some inanimate object does nothing at all, but is merely passive, let him be accursed. If any one shall affirm that all works that are performed before justification, from whatever reason they are done, are really and truly sins, and merit the displeasure of God, or that the more a man endeavors to dispose himself for grace, the more does he sin, let him be accursed. If any one shall affirm that the sinner is justified by faith alone, in the sense that nothing else is requisite which may co-operate to the attainment of the grace of justification, and that the sinner does not need to be prepared and disposed by the motion of his own will, let him be accursed."

We have come now to the Reformation Period and to the positive and direct teaching of Protestantism, upon the subject in hand, as formulated by the Confessors of Augsburg in their

ARTICLE XVIII.

"Concerning free will they teach, that the human will possesses some liberty." Melancthon says in the Apology, "Nor indeed do we deny liberty to the human will." They did not deny that universal human consciousness, distinguishing man from the rest of the creation, that his acts are *his own*, uncon-

strained by anything external. They did not take away human personality, or destroy, by their theory on this subject, the possibility of a sense of responsibility and guilt, which latter feelings are in other parts of the Confession so strongly insisted upon. They did not hold that any of the human faculties were destroyed by the fall. Man still has Reason, Feeling, Will. But a will without any freedom is no will at all. If will is "the power by which we determine personal acts" (Tappan), man still has this. If "will is that kind of causality attributed to living agents, in so far as they are possessed of reason; and freedom is such a property of that causality as enables them to originate events independently of foreign determining causes" (Kant), then fallen and unregenerate man is still possessed of will and freedom of will. If "to be free is to determine ourselves" in the sense of "knowing, feeling and willing in accordance with our individual nature" (Fichte), man still has such freedom. But what if his "individual nature" be changed from what it was? "The question," says Gerhard (v. 100), "is not concerning the essence of the will itself, whether this has survived the fall; for this we loudly maintain, viz. that man has lost not his will, but the soundness of it." "The will," he further (v. 87) says, "is an essential power of the soul, and the soul is nothing else than the powers or essential faculties themselves. Therefore whilst the soul remains, its essential powers, intellect and will, also remain. On the other hand, the power of free and uncoerced volition is essential to the will; therefore, as long as the will remains this power also remains. In this sense and in this respect we firmly believe, and profess with uplifted voice, that the will of man has remained free even after the fall." This is what is termed by some "*formal*" freedom.

The sphere of this freedom allowed to fallen and unregenerate man by our Article is "for the performance of civil duties, and for the choice of those things subject to reason:" "works of the present life, as well good as evil," as they explain in a quotation attributed to Augustine; "good works which arise from our natural goodness, such as to choose to labor in the field, to eat and drink, to choose to have a friend, to have clothing, to

build a house, to take a wife, to feed cattle, to learn various and useful arts, or to do any good thing relative to this life; all which things, however, do not exist without the divine government; yea, they exist and begin to be from Him and through Him. And in evil works, such as to choose to worship an idol, to will to commit murder, etc."

It is observable that the instances of "good works" here cited embrace nothing that has moral quality, while as to "evil works" it was scarcely necessary to cite any; because in the latter man's freedom is by no means denied, but in the former the theory is that fallen and unregenerate man can do nothing that may be truly called good, can perform no good works, can really do nothing but sin—since "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin!" Accordingly a man may externally observe all the commandments—like that earnest young ruler in the Scriptures—and yet be outside, if not far from, the kingdom of God, be without real goodness. Thus one may acknowledge God—for this, too, is within the sphere of reason, since it is only "the fool" who says "there is no God"—may abstain from taking His name in vain, and from all outward profanity, may pay outward and manifest respect to God's day and house, worshiping (outwardly) reverently with His people, may with a beautiful obedience honor his parents, may curb his passions, keep himself pure, be scrupulously honest, be liberal and kind, considerate of the poor and generous in the support of religious and charitable institutions, may, in short, be a model of an excellent citizen; and yet God who looks upon the heart, the seat of character, and knows the secrets thereof, will say of such a man—as He virtually did of the young ruler—"Thy heart is not right in the sight of God." His is a "natural goodness" of "outward works," such as are within "the judgment of reason," a "performance of civil duties," constituting a "civil righteousness" or "righteousness of works," which is within the ability of the unregenerate, but cannot justify before God, and which is no part of true sanctification.

We have somewhere read of such a man, one whose life was so exemplary that every one wondered why he did not become a member of the church. He seemed to be such in everything

except the profession. And when that man lay upon his dying bed and was asked by the ambassador of Christ, under whose ministrations he had so often sat, "What think you of Christ?" the poor man, with conscious knowledge of his own heart and with rare candor, replied, "*I hate him!*" So radically different is "natural goodness" from "spiritual righteousness." As Paul so impressively sets forth in 1 Cor. 13, declaring even him who has all knowledge, and all intellectual faith, and all charitableness, to be *nothing without love*: and "Love is of God" and not of man! In like manner, speaking of himself,—and we know the upright moral character of the man, that touching the righteousness which is in the law he was externally blameless, his outward character was unimpeachable, yet—he disclaims any real righteousness, and declares his aim, "That I may win Christ, and be found in him, not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith" (Phil. 3 : 6-11). Here and frequently he puts in sharpest contrast man's "own righteousness," that is, the "civil righteousness" of our Article, which is possible to the unregenerate, with "the righteousness of God," which becomes man's only by faith.

The Apology says of the human will, "It can to a certain extent render civil righteousness or the righteousness of works, it can speak of God, offer to God a certain service in outward works, obey magistrates and parents; by a choice in outward works can restrain the hands from murder, from adultery, from theft. Since there is left in human nature reason and judgment concerning objects subjected to the senses, choice between these things, and the liberty and power to render civil righteousness, are also left. For Scripture calls that righteousness of the flesh (Heb. 9 : 10) which the carnal nature, *i. e.* reason by itself without the Holy Ghost, renders. Although the power of concupiscence is such that men more frequently obey evil dispositions than sound judgment. And the devil, who is efficacious in the godless, as Paul says (Eph. 2 : 2), does not cease to incite this feeble nature to various offences. These are the reasons why even civil righteousness is rare among men, as we see that not even the philosophers themselves, who seem to have aspired after

this righteousness, attained it. But it is false that the man does not sin, who performs the works of the commandments without grace."

It is, however an extreme and untenable position when these acts of civil righteousness and natural goodness are themselves called sin. This overlooks the fact that the moral character of an act does not always reside in the motive only, but in the act *and* the motive; so that, whilst the motive may not be pure and good, the act itself may be. To call such acts sins is to confound distinctions and overthrow morality. They have a *moral* goodness, though not a *spiritual* goodness. The distinction between such acts and the same when done from right motives, is briefly set forth in that ever recurring opening to Luther's explanations of the commandments, "That we should *so fear and love God*"—as not to do the evil but the good toward our neighbor. The absence of this godly fear, this godly motive from the acts referred to takes them out of the religious sphere and relegates them to the merely moral and natural. The doer of them cannot claim in virtue of them restoration to harmony with God and the truly good.

Flavel compares the natural graces of unregenerate men to "flowers that decorate the dead."

It is in the realm of spiritual things that the Confessors deny all freedom to the human will. They say, "But it does not possess the power, without the influence of the Holy Spirit, of fulfilling the righteousness of God, or spiritual righteousness: for the natural man receiveth not the things which are of the Spirit of God: but this is accomplished in the heart, when the Holy Spirit is received through the word. * * It cannot perform the inner motions, such as the fear of God, faith in God, chastity, patience, etc." With this statement the other articles of the Confession, the Apology, the Smalcald Articles, and the Catechisms of Luther, fully agree; to prove which quotations from them all are made in the Formula of Concord, Sol. Dec. II. We will recite from these only from the Small Catechism, the answer to the question on the Third Article of the Creed, "What is meant by this Article?" The answer is, "I believe that I cannot, merely by my own reason or natural powers, believe in

or come to Jesus Christ, my Lord; but that the Holy Spirit hath called me by the gospel, enlightened me by his gifts, and sanctified and preserved me in the true faith, in like manner as he calls, gathers, enlightens, and sanctifies the whole Christian Church on earth, and preserves it in union with Jesus Christ, by the true faith; in which Christian Church he daily and richly forgives me and all other believers all our sins; and will at the last day, raise up me and all the dead, and will grant unto me and all that believe in Jesus Christ everlasting life.—This is most certainly true."

Man was created "in the image of God." To clearly and completely define what is meant by this is difficult. Hollazius thinks that "The substance itself of the human soul exhibits certain things that are *θεῖα* or divine, and stands related to the Divinity as to a model. For God is a Spirit, immaterial, intelligent, acting with a free will, etc. These predicates can in a certain manner be affirmed of the human soul." In this sense man did not lose the divine image through the fall: for the substance of man, that which makes him man, remains. Quenstedt (II. 17) says, "We must distinguish between the substance of man, or the matter itself, of which he is composed, and that which, as if something following, adheres most closely to the substance of man, and nevertheless, as to its accidents, perfects it internally; or we must distinguish between nature itself and its qualities, or perfections in the qualities; the image of God indicates the latter, not the former. In a few words, that the image of God is not man, but in man, *i. e.* it is not substantial or essential to man, but accidental." Wherein the divine image inhered in man's substance, it could not be lost without man's ceasing to be man: wherein it inhered in man's faculties or qualities or the perfection of them, it was lost in the fall. Man's intellect was blinded, his sensibilities weakened and deadened, his will enslaved. The day he sinned he knew good *and evil*. The divine sentence, "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die," took immediate effect: and a chief part of that death was the loss of man's freedom. Henceforth he is the servant of sin. He still indeed has the *libertas naturae*, as explained above, a formal freedom, freedom of choice in evils, but not a

freedom of power to good. "He is free," as Luthardt says, "wherein he is unfree:" free in that nature which he now has, which is a corrupted, deteriorated nature, and nowhere is this corruption more surely seen than in man's powerlessness for good. Ask almost any Sunday-school whether it is easier to do right or to do wrong, and on the spur of the moment, thinking it ought to be so, the little folks will answer, "To do right!" Then when you reply, "How is it, then, that everybody does wrong?" they are puzzled and still. Ask the same of grown people, philosophers and theologians; and Pelagians and Socinians will say it is from the habit of doing wrong, through the example of Adam. But it seems strange that a habit should be universal; that there should be one exception to it and but one, in the whole history of man. And surely none can by mere habit become a child of God or a child of the devil. Reason and experience unite in pronouncing such an answer unsatisfactory. But when it is alleged that all mankind, since the fall, are under a power operating on the soul with the like force of gravitation upon material bodies, and that there is in all men at birth an inertia of downward direction, from the force of which external power is required to deliver him, then man's evil status is sufficiently explained.

The statement of the Formula of Concord on the controversy concerning human powers, is,* "That in spiritual and divine things the intellect, heart and will cannot, in any way, by their own natural powers, understand, believe, accept, think, will, begin, effect, do, work or concur in working anything, but they are entirely dead to good, and corrupt; so that in man's nature, since the fall, there is, before regeneration, not the least spark of spiritual power remaining still present, by which, of himself, he can prepare himself for God's grace, or accept the offered grace, or, for and of himself, be capable of it, or apply or accommodate himself thereto, or, by his own powers, be able of himself, as of himself, to aid, do, work or concur in working anything for his conversion, either entirely, or in half, or in even the least or most inconsiderable part, but he is the servant of

*Form. Conc. Part II. Sol. Dec.

sin (John 8 : 34 ; Eph. 2 : 2 ; 2 Tim. 2 : 26). Hence the natural free will, according to its perverted disposition and nature, is strong and active only with respect to what is displeasing and contrary to God." This reads like a legal paper, in its effort to be explicit and exclusive. The prime question concerning this doctrine is, Is it according to the Holy Scriptures.

PROOF FROM THE SCRIPTURES OF MAN'S INABILITY TO GOOD.

God said to Adam in reference to the forbidden tree (Gen. 2 : 17), "In the day that thou eatest thereof," *i. e.* in the day that thou sinnest, "thou shalt surely die." The truth of God, observation and experience testify that straightway upon man's disobedience this sentence was executed upon him. Accordingly Paul to the Ephesians (Eph. 2 : 1-3), speaking of their natural state, calls them, "Dead in trespasses and sins"—a death which yet had about it activity, a freedom of death—"wherein," he continues, "in time past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience : among whom also we all had our conversation in times past in the lust of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind ; and were by nature the children of wrath, even as others."

Shortly before the flood we read (Gen. 6 : 3) that, "The Lord said, My Spirit shall not always strive with man, for that he also is flesh : " and, a little after, that God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually : " and the Psalmist in two places (Ps. 14 : 2, 3 ; 53 : 2, 3), wherein he is quoted by Paul to the Romans (Rom. 3 : 10, sq.) as uttering a general truth, represents God as looking down from heaven "to see if there were any that did understand and seek God," and coming to the conclusion, in his perfect knowledge of all hearts, "They are all gone aside, they are together become filthy ; there is none that doeth good, no, not one." Compare with this our Lord's words to Nicodemus (John 3 : 6), "That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit," explaining his assertion, "Ye must be born again ; " and Paul's contrast between "the flesh" and "the Spirit"

and his delineations of the conflict between the two, meaning by "the flesh" not merely the body, or the sensuous nature, but the whole corrupt nature of fallen man. David in the fifty-first Psalm cries out, not in extenuation of his crime, but in illustration of his desperate need of God's grace, "Behold I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me" (Ps. 51 : 5).

The whole tenor of the Old Testament shows on the one hand the absolute necessity of spiritual righteousness, and at the same time man's utter inability to attain to it: and thus makes man feel his need of, and prepares the way for redeeming grace in Christ.

Of the Jews of his day, so punctilious in outward observances, the Saviour said, quoting from Isaiah (Matt. 15 : 8), "This people draweth nigh unto me with their mouth, and honoreth me with their lips; but their heart is far from me. But in vain do they worship me." And explained to his disciples that "Out of the heart proceed all the things that defile a man." Paul (Eph. 4 : 17, 18) characterizes the unregenerate as walking "in the vanity of their mind, having the understanding darkened, being alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that is in them, because of the blindness of their hearts."

(1 Cor. 2 : 14): "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." See the whole of the passage in 1 Cor. 1 : 18 to 2 : 16, in which it is set forth strongly that (1 Cor. 1 : 21), "After that, in the wisdom of God, the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe." Saul converted was sent to the Gentiles (Acts 26 : 18) "To open their eyes, to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith that is in me" (Christ).

The state of the natural man respecting spiritual things is represented in the Scriptures as "darkness" (Eph. 5 : 8) and "The Light shineth in darkness; and the darkness comprehended it not" (John 1 : 5). And our Saviour says (Matt. 6 : 23), "If, therefore, the light that is in thee be darkness, how

great is the darkness!" "Without me," says Christ to his disciples (John 15 : 5), "ye can do nothing : " a statement confirmed by the illustration of the vine and the branches. A branch of the vine is of necessity incapable of bearing any fruit. (2 Cor. 3 : 5) : "Not that we are sufficient of ourselves to think anything of ourselves ; but our sufficiency is of God." (Rom. 8 : 7) : "The carnal mind is enmity against God ; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." Hence, (John 3 : 3), "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." And (2 Cor. 5 : 17), "Therefore if any man be in Christ he is a new creature : " and man can no more create himself anew than he could create himself at first. Of but One we say, "He can create, and He destroy !" (Eph. 2 : 8) : Faith itself is declared to be "the gift of God." And, (1 Cor. 12 : 3), "No man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost." (Acts 5 : 31) : Christ is declared to be exalted "to give repentance to Israel" as well as "forgiveness of sins." Paul admonishes Timothy to meekness and patience with men (2 Tim. 2 : 25), "If God peradventure will give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth." To the Jews, so careful about external acts, having a righteousness of the law, or civil righteousness, which put them in esteem among men and for which they greatly esteemed themselves, the Saviour said (John 8 : 31-36), "If ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed ; and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." To which they indignantly replied, "We be Abraham's seed, and were never in bondage to any man : how sayest thou, Ye shall be made free ? Jesus answered them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Whosoever committeth sin is the servant of sin. And the servant abideth not in the house forever ; but the Son abideth ever. If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed !"

We will let these citations suffice, though many more to the same purpose might be given.

The remedy for man's inability, thus so fully declared, the recovery to real freedom, is also in this article set forth by the Confessors. They declare that this power for spiritual right-

eousness "is accomplished in the heart when the Holy Spirit is received through the word." This means

REGENERATION AND CONVERSION.

These terms are often used synonymously: but it promotes clearer views to understand by the former the new birth, and by the latter the exhibitions of the new life in turning day by day from sin and Satan to holiness and God. The necessity for such change is evident from the natural state of fallen man as it has already been described, and from Scripture citations that have already been given as well as others that might be quoted. But the point at which our article touches this subject is not one concerning the fact of regeneration and conversion, but concerning the agency of their accomplishment.

The Pelagians taught that man by his own powers, without the grace of God, can turn himself to God, believe the gospel, work spiritual righteousness, and merit the forgiveness of sins and eternal life. The Semi-Pelagians taught that man by his own powers can make a beginning of his conversion, but cannot complete it without God's grace. Others taught that whilst man is unable to make a beginning, yet, after a beginning is made by divine grace, man can by his own natural powers add, help and co-operate in the work of renewal.

The Confessors deny to man's natural powers any ability or share whatever, exercised in and of themselves, in this work. They ascribe it from beginning to end to the grace of God ministered by the Holy Spirit. The Scriptures say, "*Repent*"—but Christ gives repentance: the Scriptures say, "*Believe*"—but faith is the gift of God: the Scriptures enjoin perfect love, and declare one without love to be nothing, spiritually—but love is of God, and he that loveth is, and must first have been, born of God. It is the Holy Spirit that opens the blind eyes, illumines the darkened understanding, convincing man of sin: it is the Holy Spirit that awakens and elevates the affections, leading man to love what God loves and hate what God hates: it is the Holy Spirit that works in man to will and to do (Phil. 2: 13) of God's good pleasure, delivering the bond-servants of sin

and introducing them into the liberty of the glory of the sons of God! (Rom. 8 : 21.) And he does this "through the word," the Holy Scriptures. "God the Holy Ghost effects conversion not without means; but uses for this purpose the preaching and hearing of God's word, as it is written (Rom. 1 : 16), 'The Gospel is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth.' Also (Rom. 10 : 17), 'Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God.' With this word the Holy Ghost is present, and opens hearts, so that they, as Lydia in Acts xvi., are attentive to it and are thus converted."* Thus at Pentecost Peter's hearers' hearts, were pricked with contrition: and similarly Christ opened the hearts of the disciples going to Emmaus to understand the Scriptures.

"For after that, in the wisdom of God, the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching, to save them that believe" (1 Cor. 1 : 21). "Sanctify them by thy truth," prays our Lord; "thy word is truth" (John 17 : 17, 18).

Hence those who imagine that without means, without the word and the sacraments, the Holy Spirit illumines men, draws them to himself, justifies and sanctifies them, as well as those who think to attain these ends by their own preparation, feelings, struggles and works of whatever sort, are in error.

Now if it be asked what we are to make of the many invitations of the Scriptures inviting and urging men to accept God's grace, to come to Christ, to seek and strive, we answer that these refer to those external things which are within the power of man, such as to use the means God has provided, to read the word, to go to church, to give attention to spiritual things, while at the same time our Lord's word is still most true, "No man can come to me except the Father which hath sent me draw him" (John 6 : 44). But even those very invitations are drawings toward Christ, and in the use of the means one will find these drawings increasing more abundantly.

It was to a little girl whose spirit had just left her body (Lk. 8 : 41-56) that Jesus said, "Maid arise," and she arose straightway: it was to a young man whose corpse they were bearing

*Form. Conc., Part I. 2.

to the grave (Lk. 7 : 11-15) that Jesus said, "Young man, I say unto thee, Arise"; and he that was dead sat up and began to speak: it was to a man who had been dead four days already and been buried (John 11 : 39-44) that Jesus said, "Lazarus, come forth," and he came out with his grave clothes bound about him. And these are but types of God's word to men "dead in trespasses and in sins," young and old, bidding them live: the words that Jesus speaks to them are spirit and life; and when his "I say unto you" comes to any one, there comes with it power to do the bidden thing. But the condition is, "If any man will hear his voice!" For the bad power of closing and hardening the heart belongs to man.

PREDESTINATION.

Here arises a question, at once philosophical and practical. How is it that, among those to whom the gospel is preached and God's grace offered, some are regenerated and converted, and others are not? If men are equally unable to do anything whatsoever toward this end, and are equally hostile to God, the logical deduction seems to be that the cause of the difference inquired into lies in God. Augustine accepted this conclusion and resorted to the theory of unconditional Predestination, based on the sovereignty of God. God has from all eternity chosen a portion of mankind to be the recipients of his grace and salvation, and that irrespective of any foreseen faith or character in them, and has left the rest of mankind in their fallen, helpless and condemned condition. Moreover to the chosen ones God's grace is an irresistible power, overcoming the utmost intensity of man's self-will and aversion.

It is just here that our Church parts company with Augustinianism. Having kept it close company all through the subject of Anthropology hitherto, here she draws the line and says, "Thus far, but no further." It is into this theological slough that our Missouri brethren have fallen, in the midst of which they are struggling, while Calvinists, creeping out at the sides, in amazement cry, "Are ye become like unto us?" and the Ohio and Wisconsin brethren are vigorously throwing stones at them, with reproaches for so besmirching the "*reine Lehre!*"

For whilst Luther and other individuals in Reformation times may have been extreme Predestinarians of the Augustinian type, this never was the doctrine of the Church. Among the points expressly condemned in the Formula of Concord are these:

1. When it is taught that God does not wish all men to repent and believe the gospel.
2. That, when God calls us to himself, he is not in earnest that all men should come to him.
3. That God does not wish every one to be saved, but, without regard to their sins, alone from the counsel, purpose and will of God, some are appointed to condemnation, so that they cannot be saved.

And the same authority declares:—That, however, 'many are called, few are chosen,' does not mean that God is unwilling that all should be saved, but the reason is that they either do not at all hear God's word, but wilfully despise it, close their ears and harden their hearts, and in this manner foreclose the ordinary way to the Holy Ghost, so that he cannot effect his work in them, or, when it is heard, they consider it of no account, and do not heed it. For this [that they perish] not God or his election, but their wickedness, is responsible.*

Paying less attention to logic and more to the Scriptures our Church teaches that the reason why any to whom the gospel is preached and grace is offered are not regenerated, converted and saved, is because they resist the Holy Ghost and refuse to accept the offered grace. For in evil we have seen that man has freedom of will, and he may by his own natural powers refuse and resist God's grace. And if it be said that the natural resistance of all men is alike and the same, we reply that there may be and is an additional, superadded wilful resistance. For just as the regenerate man through the power of the Holy Spirit, with which his renewed powers can and do now co-operate, goes on from grace to grace, from strength to strength in that which is good, so the unregenerated, following the evil bent of his depraved mind through voluntary choices, goes on to more ungodliness: and so there are, from many occasions, differences in the voluntary character of unregenerate men. Moreover

*Form. Conc., Part I. 11.

God has too much respect for his creature man, to un-man him by forcing his will : God will not, to convert man, destroy his moral agency. And though the Scriptures speak of the natural heart as a hard and stony heart, and some of our theologians have expressed themselves very strongly in comparing the natural man to a block or stone or pillar of salt, yet, as the Formula of Concord (Part II. 2) says, "God has a *modus agendi*, or way of working in a man, as in a rational creature, quite different from his way of working in another creature that is irrational, or in a stone and block." He treats him as a man, enlightens, beseeches, urges, threatens, but does not force him.

Said Christ to Jerusalem that had neglected and despised her day of grace (Matt. 23 : 37), "How often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not !" Stephen to the same generation said (Acts 7 : 51), "Ye stiff-necked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Ghost : as your fathers did, so do ye." To the Ephesians Paul says (Eph. 4 : 30), "And grieve not the Holy Spirit of God : " and to the Thessalonians (Thess. 5 : 19), "Quench not the Spirit." Man is regarded as so much harder for God to work upon than even a stone or block in that he has this power of resisting God in spiritual things, which by their very nature must be voluntary.

Calvin, at the head of the Reformed Church, fully adopted the Augustinian theory of Predestination, and sought to bring over Melanchthon to the same view : but the latter was horrified at the doctrine, and called Calvin "the modern Zeno, who wanted to introduce a stoical necessity into the Church." Neander says that when Calvin sent him his confession of faith, Melanchthon struck his pen through the whole passage on Predestination.*

It was, probably, on account of his revulsion from this doctrine, and his sense of the logical tendency of a rigid monergism in that direction that Melanchthon, in his writings subsequent to the Augsburg Confession and the Apology, allowed that there was in man's natural powers "a faculty of applying himself to grace," and taught that there are three concurrent causes

*See Neander : Hist. Christ. Dogmas, Vol. II.

in man's regeneration and conversion, viz., the word of God, the Holy Ghost, and the will of man. He made the non-resisting will of man an active factor. This teaching is seen in the 1835 and 1843 editions of his *Loci Theologici*. This co-operation of man by his natural powers in spiritual things is called synergism, and is condemned by the standards of our Church.

Says the Formula of Concord, "Conversion to God is a work of God the Holy Ghost alone, who is the true master-workman that alone works this in us, for which he uses the preaching and hearing of his Holy Word as his ordinary means and instrument. But the understanding and will of the unregenerate man are nothing else than the *subjectivum convertendum*, i. e. that which is to be converted, as the understanding and will of a spiritually dead man, in whom the Holy Ghost works conversion and renewal, for which work the will of the man who is to be converted does nothing, but allows God alone to work in him, until he is regenerate; and then also by the Holy Ghost he works (co-operates) in other succeeding good works that which is pleasing to God, in the way and to the extent fully set forth above."*

As has been said, the two tendencies, represented by Pelagius and Augustine, continue until this day. The Romish Church still teaches that man's moral nature was not totally depraved by the fall but only weakened, and that, therefore, man can fit himself through his own moral power for the acceptance of justifying grace, and thus to a certain extent merit the same, and is able, after renewing justifying grace, not only to keep all God's commandments and through good works directly to merit eternal salvation, but even to perform works of supererogation. The Calvinistic and Arminian controversy has kept up the antagonism concerning the nature of man's inheritance from Adam, irresistible grace and predestination. And the modern Socinians and Rationalists, in advocacy of philanthropy and humanity, speak chiefly of the dignity and possibilities of man, exalting his merely natural powers, so detracting from the necessity and worth of God's grace.

*Form. Conc., Part II. 2.

It is not long since we heard a distinguished Unitarian divine,* setting forth the tenets of his sect, extol their humanity, their reputation for education and culture, and say it was no part of their teaching to say or sing, "Oh, to be nothing, nothing,"† but rather, "Oh, to be something, *something*!"—a laudable ambition, indeed, if sought for in the only way by which man may recover his original freedom and greatness and attain even higher position than that. That man who, excepting the Perfect One, was "something" above any of whom history speaks, declares' "By the grace of God I am what I am!" But there was little or nothing heard of grace in the discourse or on the occasion of which we speak.

Indeed the times are not characterized by deep sense of sin or helpless need of God's grace as offered in the Church of Christ. Men have not time to know themselves. The demands of business and of society are all-engrossing. God's word and ordinances are much slighted by indifference or haste. So that men come to feel that they do not need the Church; they can be as good without. And this, from the easy-going trifler who can worship God as well in the field as in the congregation of His people, and needs not the Bible since it is no more inspired than all truth, nor the sacraments, since they are too simple or too supernatural to mean any thing to him—to the educated, thinking apostles and devotees of culture, who think to attain the highest development by the exercise and discipline of their own natural powers.

Even in the Sunday-School the young people are carelessly taught to sing such songs as "Only an armor-bearer" with its

*Dr. Ware, of Boston, at dedication of All Souls' Church, Washington, D. C.

†The whole stanza reads:

Oh, to be nothing, nothing,
Only to lie at his feet,
A broken and emptied vessel,
For the Master's use made meet.
Emptied that he might fill me
As forth to His service I go;
Broken, that so unhindered,
His life through me might flow.

boastful, self-dependent chorus, "Surely the Captain can depend on me : " and these self-vaunting, subjective, rollicking songs claim equal place with such hymns as, "I need Thee every hour, Most Gracious Lord," and, "More love to Thee, O Christ, more love to Thee," and, "Rock of Ages, cleft for me, Let me hide myself in Thee"—hymns born of a consciousness of human helplessness and the humble spirit of entire dependence on God, the God of our salvation.

The practical effect of our church's teaching in the matter of Liberty and Grace should be, upon the unregenerate, to lead them to constantly use the means of grace that they may be in the way of salvation and, when Jesus of Nazareth passeth by, may have their eyes opened to see and know their Liberator, their Saviour ; to make them fear lest, by neglecting and resisting the Holy Spirit, they may grieve Him away and they be left forever in their helpless bondage to sin ; that, when God calls, they may not refuse, and reject the counsel of God against themselves, to their everlasting death. And upon the regenerate the effect should be to make them diligent in the great business of life, quick to listen to and obey the Spirit's sanctifying influences, careful lest they receive the grace of God in vain, working out their own salvation with fear and trembling, while God works in them to will and to do of his good pleasure : and, on the other hand, to make them eager to bring to the knowledge of all people that sacred word through which the Holy Spirit enlightens, frees and sanctifies the heart, that all men may come, according to God's gracious will (1 Tim. 2 : 4), to the knowledge of the truth and be saved.

ARTICLE II.

THE RELATION OF THE LUTHERAN CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES TO THE LIME-STONE DISTRICTS.

By REV. SYLVANUS STALL, A. M., Lancaster, Pa.

Influences in the beginning unobserved, and apparently unnoteworthy, may nevertheless be so potent as subsequently to be recognized as productive of most marked results. Such influences, elsewhere exhibited in the history of nations and the lives of men, are to be seen by a study of the location and growth of the ecclesiastical denominations in this country. Particularly is this principle illustrated and its results shown by a study of the relation of the Lutheran Church in the United States to the lime-stone districts.

The earliest Lutherans who came to this country were the Dutch who settled at New Amsterdam (New York), and Beverswyke (Albany); subsequently followed by others who settled, some at Athens, N. Y., and others in Bergen and Hunterdon counties in New Jersey. While these Hollanders acted an important part in the early history of our Church in this country, yet they were not numerous, neither did they manifest the local preferences which in subsequent years gave direction to the German immigrations and largely determined the location of the Lutheran Church in the United States.

When the German Lutherans came they were not controlled by these gregarious tendencies which inclined others to congregate in the more populous centres, nor did an imperfect knowledge of husbandry lead them to prefer such lands as should yield the largest immediate fruitage or command the readiest price in the market. The Dutch in New York, and the Scotch Irish in Pennsylvania, preferred the light-timbered and easily-cleared up-lands, while the Germans followed the streams, preferred the heavy-timbered low-lands, manifesting a special preference for the lime-stone districts, where the land, when exhausted,

could more easily be renewed and be kept in a constant state of greatest productiveness. At first thought these influences seem slight, or even insignificant, but they have largely shaped the ecclesiastical map of to-day and throw light on the path of the future.

That we may be sure of our premise let the history, briefly reviewed, establish the facts. In 1708 Great Britain sent fifty-three Palatine Lutheran refugees to this country and settled them upon a tract of 2,190 acres of land, 500 acres of which was a glebe set apart for the support of a church and "the maintenance of a Lutheran minister and his successors forever." This settlement was upon the west bank of the Hudson, and the city of Newburgh is built upon the glebe. The location was not congenial to the agricultural German mind, and in a few years an uninterrupted migration to the lime-stone districts left but a single Lutheran family and the glebe passed to the Episcopalians, then to the Presbyterians, and is now controlled by the city, the rent being appropriated to the support of the public schools. Thus ended Lutheranism in Newburgh.

In 1710 Great Britain brought over in ten ships three or four thousand more Palatine refugees and located them upon a tract of 6,000 acres of land about 110 miles above New York on the east side of the Hudson, in what is now the town of Germantown, Columbia county. Others settled upon the opposite side of the river at West Camp. The production of tar, resin, pitch and turpentine from these "pine forests," which the British government had purposed for their naval stores, having proven a failure, the colony sent out a delegation in search of better lands. They went into the interior, struck the Schoharie creek, followed it until they reached the Schoharie valley with its clear water, rich lands and lime-stone rock. Here the agricultural requirements of the German mind were fully met, and to this locality many of the Palatines speedily removed. As a result there are to-day twelve Lutheran congregations in Schoharie county. Some went into the Mohawk valley, and others scattered through Rensselaer, Albany, Montgomery and other counties; while of those who remained upon the banks of the Hudson, some removed into the northern portion of Dutchess county, and

east as far as Livingston and Ancram. When the migrations of this colony of Germans who constituted the beginnings of the Lutheran Church in the state of New York are followed, it will be found that when they moved in any considerable numbers their eventual settlement was upon the choicest lands, and when uncontrolled by foreign circumstances, it was upon limestone bottom.

The same is true in Pennsylvania. The Lutherans who settled in Lancaster county followed the streams, selecting the richest lands, wooded with forests of large oaks. The Scotch-Irish, impatient of delay, preferred the up-lands where the scrub-oak was quickly felled, the land easily cleared, and where an early harvest would speedily reward their toil. Hence the names of many of the townships in the richer districts are of German origin, while such as Colerain, Donegal and others indicate an early Scotch-Irish settlement. These tendencies of the earlier immigrants are to be found not only in Lancaster county, but are clearly defined in the broad lime-stone belt which sweeps across the State, including in its area the cities of Easton, Allentown, Reading, Lebanon, Lancaster, York and Harrisburg.

The influences thus traced in New York and Pennsylvania, have also been operative, and may be alike followed in Ohio, Illinois, Indiana and other States, and may account in a large measure for the absence of Lutheran congregations in New England.

By a further study it is readily discovered that the Lutheran Church, in the lime-stone districts and richest agricultural localities, has steadily, and in many instances rapidly increased in strength, while during the same period and upon the same territory other denominations have relatively and some even numerically declined.

Early in the history of Pennsylvania the Germans, principally Lutherans, settled in York and Adams counties, while the adjoining counties of Cumberland and Franklin were settled almost exclusively by Scotch-Irish Presbyterians. Presbyterian churches were planted from Mechanicsburg to Mercersburg, and this portion of the Cumberland valley was held by that de-

nomination in unrivaled possession. But the Germans, many from York and Adams counties, attracted by the fertile lands and lime-stone rock gradually began to cross the mountain and settle on the rich farms purchased from their Scotch-Irish neighbors. The Presbyterian churches were already numerous and strong, but gradually small struggling congregations of Lutherans sprang up. The immigrations continued each year and the Lutheran churches began to multiply and grow, until in 1861 the membership of the Presbyterian churches in Cumberland and Franklin counties numbered 3,174 and the Lutherans 3,621. In 1881 the Presbyterians numbered 3,637, the Lutherans 5,007. Thus in 20 years the Presbyterians had increased but 14 per cent. while the Lutheran increase was 38 per cent.—and during the same period the Lutheran Church in York and Adams counties had increased 60 per cent. In 1861 the Lutherans in Adams county had but four pastorates, to-day they have twelve. The same is seen in Lancaster county. In 1861 the Presbyterians numbered 1,795, the Lutherans 2,958, and in 1881 their numbers were 2,706 and 7,039 respectively. While the Presbyterians have increased 51 per cent. the Lutherans have increased 138 per cent.

What has tended to this disproportionate development between the different denominations is, in some instances at least, not difficult to determine. In the case of the Scotch-Irish Presbyterians they have proven true to their characteristic instincts and gregarious tendencies. The poorer lands at first selected have finally brought them into unequal competition with their far-sighted German neighbors with their unending toil, untiring patience and frugal habits. Naturally seeking quick and easy gains, the tendencies of the young have constantly been toward the larger towns and cities, the centres of commercial life and financial power. Occasionally, by removal, death or failure, these farms have found their way into the market, and gradually, but steadily, the most productive have found waiting purchasers in the descendants of the earlier German settlers. Thus the Scotch-Irish families have decreased with each decade, while the German element has gradually come into possession of the same territory. In some instances, be-

cause of remoteness from churches of their own faith, intermarriage of children or other circumstances, these Germans have found their way into the Presbyterian churches, but their numbers have not been sufficient to arrest the steady decline.

These are the influences which have left several hundred Presbyterian congregations in rich rural districts with less than one hundred members—the numbers annually decreasing, the decline not only having become chronic, but threatening to necessitate the final abandonment of these localities to other denominations better suited to occupy the territory. That the condition indicated actually exists is attested both by an examination of the minutes of the General Assembly, and by the increasing number of applications for aid which annually come from congregations once self-supporting.

The problem for solution is, whether by aid continued for a long term of years the Presbyterian Church may be able to bring these declining congregations to that period when the distinctive characteristics of national ancestry shall be lost in our unity of national life and character; or whether, upon the other hand, it would not be wiser to appropriate these same funds to the establishment of churches in the growing West. Whichever policy is pursued, the facts herein developed make it manifest that the permanency of the Presbyterian Church in the rural districts will require the incorporation of the largest possible number of resident Germans.

What has tended to this disparity of increase between the Lutheran and denominations other than the Presbyterian may not be so easily explained, yet the fact remains that in many instances there has been a marked diversity. Even in the German Reformed Church, where naturally we would expect an equal increase, the results are decidedly in favor of the Lutherans. In Lancaster county, Pa., in 1861 the membership in the Reformed Church was 2,106 and the Lutheran 2,958. In 1881 the Reformed membership was 3,638 and the Lutheran 7,039—an increase of 71 and 138 per cent. respectively. In the south-eastern portion of Westmoreland and Fayette counties, Pa., the disparity is exhibited in the fact that five (the Milliron, Donegal, Indian Creek, Barren Run, and Forks) congregations have act-

ually become extinct—four having been dropped from the roll of the Westmorland Classis between the years 1845 and 1859, but services having been continued at intervals as late as 1872. While these instances are by no means exceptional, yet it will be remembered they are given, not for the purpose of showing that the Reformed Church in this country is dying out, but to illustrate the fact, that upon the lime-stone bottom the Lutheran church has tended to a more steady increase, and in many, and perhaps most instances, has grown more rapidly than the other denominations, and in some instances, in rural districts, has prospered while others have become extinct.

The effects of these same tendencies are carried further and exhibited in other national characteristics which go far toward explaining why the relative growth of the Lutheran and Presbyterian Churches should generally be exactly the reverse in the cities, from that found in the rural lime-stone districts. While the Germans are untiring in their industry and economy, they are alike cautious and even slow in assuming financial risks. They do not naturally prefer commercial life. The Germans are great linguists, and the tendencies of that type of mind are seen in their daily vocations as a class. It is the mathematical mind that decides promptly, acts quickly, and rushes forward to immediate success. Hence in extensive mercantile enterprises, commercial risks and large financial gains, when occupying the same territory and enjoying the same opportunities, the men of easy and rapid gains will be found largely to predominate in the Presbyterian and Episcopal, as over against the Lutheran and Reformed Churches. Where this is not the case in our cities and commercial centres, it is the exception and not the rule. This will be evident by a few instances. In 1873 the bankers of the Juniata valley assembled at Tyrone, Pa., to consider by what means they could husband their currency and prevent a run upon the banks. The conference, composed of presidents, cashiers and heaviest stockholders, consisted of thirty persons, four of whom were Methodists, one Episcopalian and the large proportion of the remainder Presbyterians; and while many of the inhabitants are Lutherans, yet that Church had not a single representative. In Blair county, Pa., there are numerous

Lutheran churches, and yet there is but one Lutheran banker in the county. In the city of York, Pa., where there is a large and wealthy German population we find the Lutheran churches have 1939 members, of whom 29 are bankers—one banker to every 67 members. The Presbyterians have 382 members, ten of them bankers—one to every 38 members. The Reformed church 1073 members, five bankers—one to every 214 members. The other bankers are, 10 Episcopalians, 5 Methodists, one Jew. Thus it will be seen that even in Lutheran and German Reformed centres, the Presbyterian and Episcopal are represented by a larger percentage of bankers and commercial men than the Lutheran and Reformed Churches.

If space permitted it would be interesting to notice how these tendencies have affected the questions of ministerial support and benevolent contributions. How they have given especially to the Presbyterian Church ecclesiastical prestige in our larger centres, affecting the endowment of educational institutions, beneficiary education of young men, support of superannuated ministers, as well as every agency and institution of charity. In all these matters the Teutonic has been surpassed by the Celtic race.

One of the coming problems for the Presbyterian Church will be the sustentation of its ministers and the development of its congregations in many of the rural districts. The question is even now demanding an answer. With the Lutheran and Reformed denominations the old difficulty of language, the retaining of the young in the church of their fathers, and the occupying of the large centres of population—these are the perplexing questions to which time and a long residence in the new world have but partially afforded an answer. The solution of these and many other problems demands a full acquaintance with those currents of national migration which are still sweeping across the continent with direction diversified, yet with a flow as clearly defined as the currents of the ocean.

ARTICLE III.

HISTORY OF THE LUTHERAN CONGREGATION AT FREDERICK, MD.

By B. M. SCHMUCKER, D. D., Pottstown, Pa.

A carefully prepared history of this congregation, written by Rev. Dr. George Diehl, was published in the *Evangelical Review*, April, 1856. As pastor of the congregation its records were in his possession and without doubt all that could be learned from them is given in that article. But we have found additional sources of information, so authentic and so important, that we have thought that it would be of interest to the Lutherans of Frederick and to the many descendants of those who have gone out from that venerable centre of Lutheran influence, to read anew the story of the establishment and progress of the church in that place. The additional authorities to which we refer are, a manuscript history of the congregation, prepared Feb. 13, 1833, by Rev. Dr. D. F. Schæffer, who became its pastor in 1808, preserved by Dr. S. S. Schmucker; the Halle Reports, covering the period from 1742-1785, which were not exhaustively examined by Dr. Diehl; the MS. Journals of Rev. Dr. H. M. Muhlenberg; the MS. Protocol of the Ministerium of Penn'a from 1781-1810, and its printed minutes from 1811 until the formation of the Synod of Maryland and Virginia in 1820, during which whole period the congregation was connected with that ministerium; some original letters from the officers of the congregation and Rev. Mr. Hausile to Rev. J. H. Schaum in 1751-1753, preserved by the family of the latter; the memoranda concerning Rev. Mr. Hausihl by Hon. Brantz Mayer; together with a few other less important sources. All of these have been examined with care in the preparation of this sketch.

The earliest settlement of Germans in the vicinity of Frederick is said by Dr. Diehl to have been made perhaps as soon as 1729 or 1730. Dr. D. F. Schæffer says a number of Germans

settled in the neighborhood as early as 1740 and that the settlement was then called Manaquasy. We have no doubt that Dr. Diehl's statement is the more accurate of the two. It is certain that from 1730 on great efforts were made by the Governor of Virginia and then by Lord Fairfax to secure settlers in the Shenandoah Valley, and that the speculators who contracted to furnish them used every inducement to persuade the Germans in Pennsylvania and the Dutch in New Jersey and the immigrants arriving at Philadelphia to remove to Virginia. In 1732, I think it was, Jost Hite, a German, and Jacob Van Meter, a Hollander, engaged to settle 200 families, on lands ceded to them, and went to Pennsylvania and New Jersey, Germany and Holland for the purpose. The route of travel from Pennsylvania was through Lancaster, York, Hanover or the Conewago settlements, crossing the Monocacy about ten miles North of Frederick and following its general course past where Frederick now stands. With keen sight and fixed habit to hunt out good lands, they could never have seen the beautiful country about Frederick without being tempted to settle. Dr. Muhlenberg states that between 1742, when he arrived, and 1747, one half of the Providence congregation, of which he had charge, removed to the extreme limits of Pennsylvania and to Maryland and Virginia, and this movement had begun much earlier. The settlements on the Conewago were begun 1730-1732, and we have little doubt that those on the Monocacy are of the same date. The earliest settlement was probably made about ten miles north of Frederick where the old road crossed the stream; at least the earliest and largest Lutheran congregation was at that place. It was the original mother church to which the Lutherans all along the Monocacy at first belonged and of which the congregation at Frederick was a daughter. Even in 1747, Dr. Muhlenberg speaks of the two as one congregation, Halle Reports, pp. 234-8. It was the establishment of the town and its erection to a county seat which soon made the church in town take precedence.

Frederick was laid out as a town in Sept. 1745, by Mr. Patrick Dulany of Annapolis; in 1748, at the formation of the new

county of Frederick, it was made the County-town. The date of the earliest baptism entered in the records of the Lutheran congregation is Aug. 22, 1737; it was the son of Frederick Unsult and administered by Rev. Mr. Wolf. It is not at all certain that it was administered at Frederick, but probably at the place from which the parents removed, possibly the German settlement on the Raritan in New Jersey, where at that time Rev. Jno. Aug. Wolf was pastor.

Dr. Schaeffer says, "A congregation was in existence in the year 1741, for in that year children were baptized and recorded in the books of the church. However incomplete our books and documents are, yet it appears, that a place of worship was built or purchased in 1743. Then Rev. David Candler was pastor." At what time the congregation was organized can scarcely be ascertained with entire accuracy. It was an organized congregation in 1743 when Candler was pastor, and it may have been at an earlier date. Candler was the first pastor, but many of the congregations at that period were organized before they had a settled pastor. Along the road of principal travel which passed through Frederick the congregation of York was organized in 1733 by Rev. John Casper Støever, who had charge until 1743 when Rev. David Candler took charge; Candler organized the Conewago congregation in 1743 and took charge of the Monocacy congregation and its branch where Frederick stands in the same year. Of the Rev. David Candler we know very little; he settled in Heidelberg twp., now Adams Co., about a mile from where Hanover now stands, where he at first gathered the people in his own house for worship, but in the year of his arrival a log church was built near his house. He had charge of the congregations at York, Conewago, Monocacy and Frederick. In our examination of the records of nearly all the congregations then in existence east of the Susquehanna we have found no trace of him. He entered in the Conewago records the baptism of four of his children, the earliest of Aug. 1738, the latest of May 1744. He died in 1744 and was buried at Conewago. It is probable that he was ordained by Rev. J. C. Støever, who had charge of the York congregation and resided at New Holland, Lancaster Co., Pa., where,

and in Berks and Lebanon counties, he had a large field of labor and continued to organize additional congregations. As his ministrations at York continued until those of Candler began, it is very probable that he found and ordained a successor to relieve him of that part of his extended field of labor and also to care for the settlers on the Conewago and Monocacy.

After Candler's death, the Conewago congregation was placed, Dec. 1744, under the care of Rev. Lars Nyberg a Swede, pastor at Lancaster, Pa., who was secretly a Moravian, and caused fierce strife at Lancaster by his efforts to carry the Lutheran congregation over to the Moravians. Muhlenberg says that Nyberg was for a time in charge of the Monocacy congregation and visited them frequently, (*Halle Reports*, p. 232), and without doubt preached occasionally at Frederick. At the close of 1745, or early in 1746, Nyberg threw off his disguise and tried to introduce a Moravian missionary from Bethlehem into the congregations on the Monocacy as well as at Conewago, but this movement led to his exclusion from these churches. The Monocacy congregation was rent in twain by the efforts of the Moravians to get possession, and at the close of the struggle the Moravian party established the settlement at Graceham, the Lutherans retaining the old church, which we believe has long since gone to decay and the site been abandoned.

As there is some doubt as to the correctness of the information on which the statement of the location of the old Monocacy church is based, Rev. Dr. J. A. Seiss examined the records of the Moravian congregation at Graceham in order if possible to obtain additional information. He writes, July 28, 1883, "I find it recorded that in 1745 a Lutheran and Reformed church existed, situated near the Monocacy, on the main road from Taneytown to Frederick, about three and one half miles south-east of Graceham. At the death of Rev. D. Candler at Conewago, his funeral sermon was preached by Rev. Laurentius Nyberg of Lancaster. A number of the people of the Monocacy church went to his funeral and there heard Nyberg and were so pleased with him that they applied to him to procure for them some one like himself who would preach for them. Nyberg conferred with the Moravian authorities at Bethlehem with a view to procure

a man, which finally resulted in his own appointment to go and serve the Monocacy church. He was followed in 1746 or 1747 by Rev. Nicke, but a protest against having a Moravian minister was made and a split occurred. Nicke preached but one sermon in the Monocacy church, after which he and his adherents were locked out. This faction retired westward and held services for a time in the house of one Jacob Weller (or Welsler). Nicke and his party carried their grievances to Annapolis to Dulany, proprietor of the lands in the region. He became interested in their story and granted them 10 acres of land on which to erect a church. This was the beginning of what afterwards became the Moravian town of Gnadenheim, which subsequently was changed into Graceham. Dulany's gift was made in 1747, and there has been upon it a regular succession of Moravian ministers ever since. The Monocacy church, out of which this colony came, I found no longer referred to in the Moravian Records."

It would appear that the old church stood ten miles from Frederick and about three and a half miles from Graceham, on or near the old road from Frederick through Taneytown, Hanover, and York to Lancaster. Probably Hawk's church is the most direct successor of the Old Monocacy church. Muhlenberg states that the Frederick congregation was also much distracted by the efforts of the Moravians.

In this their time of trial the congregation applied, in the summer of 1746, to the United Lutheran Ministers of Penna. and asked to be taken under their care, (Halle Reports, p. 234). Mr. Muhlenberg was unable at this time to visit them, but at his request, Rev. Gabriel Naesman, pastor of the Swedish church at Wicacoa, Philadelphia, who could preach in German, and who for some time regularly visited Lancaster after Nyberg was excluded, made a visit to Frederick in Oct. 1746.

On the 31st of October Mr. Naesman preached in the new town of Monocacy, baptized one young man, nineteen years of age, and six children. He caused a large and well bound Record-book to be purchased, in which he entered the fact of his preaching at the date given and his baptism and gave instructions to have the records of Candler and all other entries cop-

ied into the new book. Fifty-four baptisms previous to Oct. 1746 were so entered.

In 1746, or early in 1747, Frederick and Monocacy were visited by the notorious vagabond Carl Rudolph, who claimed to be a Lutheran minister, and showed testimonials with great seals which were probably forged or at least false. We learn of him first in Georgia where he scarcely escaped the gallows; then he wandered northward through the Carolinas and Virginia until he arrived at Frederick. He tarried wherever he found a congregation and offered his services. He is said by Muhlenberg to have served in Maryland congregations, German and Irish. He was accepted at Monocacy as pastor, but very soon showed himself to be a thief, a drunkard, licentious and utterly worthless, and was soon dismissed here as every where else. He went to Conewago, to New Holland where he stole Parson Kraft's gown, in Nov. 1747 he was at Raritan, N. J., he enlisted as a soldier and went to New England where he was in prison; afterward he appeared in Hartwig's charge in Dutchess Co., N. Y.

Another vagabond who attempted to creep into the congregation at Frederick in 1747 was a man whom Muhlenberg terms *Empiricus Schmid*. He was a quack who pretended to be a physician and dentist, resided in New Hanover, Pa., and as early at least as 1736 attempted to perform ministerial acts. When Muhlenberg took charge there in 1742 there was not room enough for both; after attempting to organize an opposition congregation, in 1743 Schmid left. He was afterward in Virginia, and in June 1747 was at Frederick where he found a few supporters, (*Halle Reports*, p. 238).*

Mr. Muhlenberg had long been distressed at the accounts he received of the distraction Nyberg and the Moravians had caused among the congregations which had been served by Mr. Candler, and at last in 1747 when the Pentecostal communions and confirmations in his own charge were over he decided to visit them and try to restore order. He has given a full and in-

*Helmuth's *Life of H. M. Muhlenberg*, p. 33. *Muhlenberg's Autobiography*, pp. 122, 125, 133, 158.

teresting account of his journey and its varying incidents, (Halle Reports, pp. 224-245). Setting out from New Hanover, June 10, 1747, he took the schoolmaster Jacob Lœser with him and went to the Alsace church, to Tulpehocken and through Lancaster to York and then to Conewago. Here two deputies from Monocacy met him and took him, June 23, to their home. He says; "I was now at Manaqesy, of which the Moravians boast so much in their reports. I found here a log church and two parties in the congregation. Some adhered to the Moravians, and had allowed themselves to be ministered to by Mr. Nicky, one of their teachers, who, when I came, had just returned to Bethlehem. The other party had accepted the deceiver Carl Rudolph as their preacher, but some time before had dismissed him. They had the same experiences with Nyberg as the members at York and Conawaque and at last had locked him out of the church, because he had tried to introduce a Moravian brother as a Lutheran preacher. They had now for nearly a year earnestly entreated that one of our ministers should come and administer the Lord's Supper to them. We could not refuse. My arrival was very acceptable to them and an occasion of joy."

He then describes his efforts to restore peace. He assembled the congregation and before service, he asked for their church record in which he wrote, in the English language, some articles in part of the following import: "That our German Lutherans confess their adherence to the Holy Scriptures and also to the Unaltered Augsburg Confession and the other Symbolical Books; also that whenever possible, in accordance with the same, they have the sacraments administered by regularly called and ordained ministers, and that their rules do not allow that open and wilful offenders against the ten commandments of God and against the laws of a Christian government should be acknowledged by them as members, and other things to the same effect. These articles I read publicly to the congregation and explained them in German and requested that whoever would be and remain a Lutheran of this kind should subscribe them." He explains that he wrote them in English that they might be of service if any legal difficulties arose.

The communion was afterward administered. There were violent rains for several days which prevented distant members from attending. We have quoted so much of this narrative because of the close connection of the Monocacy congregation with that at Frederick.

The narrative continues: "On the 25th of June we rode on ten miles farther to a newly laid out town, where a number of Lutherans lived, who also belong to the congregation, but who were prevented by the heavy rains from being present on the previous day. Most of them subscribed the articles in the church record, and elected several of their own number as deacons (*Vorsteher*) and elders. Three or four persons had adhered to a man who formerly at New Hanover, had assumed the functions of the ministry, (in his diary Mr. M. mentions his name, "my predecessor at New Hanover, the *Empiricus Schmid*), and had gone from there to Virginia and had now returned to Maryland. There was a large assemblage of English and German people. At the desire of many members, after preparatory service and prayer had been held, I administered the Holy Supper to some Lutherans, baptized children and married two couples. Both the flocks, that in town and that in the country, begged that I would take to heart their distraction, poverty and need of a preacher, and lay them before our venerable Fathers. They would try to hold together as long as possible. In the evening we rode back to our former quarters."

It is probable that the articles subscribed at Monocacy were also entered into the church record at Frederick and signed by the members. Dr. Diehl says that on the 24th of June a constitution was adopted and signed by the church wardens and twenty-six additional male communicants. As the meeting at Frederick was held June 25, it would seem that the date of the meeting at Monocacy was used, inasmuch as both congregations were regarded as one.

After Muhlenberg's visit in 1847 it is probable that Frederick was occasionally visited by one of the United Penna. Ministers, especially by Rev. I. H. Schaum of York, who after Aug. 1748 visited Conewago regularly once a month. Toward the close of 1749 Rev. Valentine Kraft moved to Frederick, and al-

though there is no evidence that he was accepted by the congregation as pastor, he probably officiated irregularly and had some adherents. Kraft was an aged pastor, who for some reason was dismissed by the authorities of the Principality of Zweibrueck, and landed at Phila. Aug. 25, 1742. He claimed to have been sent over by the Consistory of Darmstadt to set in order the Lutheran congregations here. He was accepted in their need by the congregations at Philadelphia and Germantown, but soon showed his unworthiness and at Muhlenberg's arrival was superseded. He was a violent opponent of Muhlenberg. He wandered about in Berks and Lancaster counties, and in 1747 came to Conewago where he was accepted for a year, and bought land which he soon lost and was arrested. At Frederick he was very poor and infirm and his condition excited sympathy; the wardens of the English church visited him and allowed him £10 per year as charity. He died some time in 1751.

Another vagabond of the name of Streiter, who was unordained, but in 1743 began to act as minister in Bucks Co., Pa., and in 1745 had crept into congregations near Reading, came to Frederick in 1751 and caused no little trouble by his efforts to gain adherents. The faithful members and officers of the congregation, however, mindful of the articles which they had adopted, strove diligently to keep such men out. They renewed with increasing urgency their entreaties to the Pennsylvania ministers to be regularly visited until they could secure a worthy pastor. It was arranged that Rev. John Helfrich Schaum of York should yield to their request and during 1751 and 1752 he both visited them and gave them counsel.

Some letters written at the time by officers of the congregation to Rev. Mr. Schaum throw such light upon the condition of affairs that we give a translation of the most interesting one of them.

FREDERICK'S TOWN, Feb. 2, 1752.

Rev. and honorable Pastor, much loved and dear Friend.

According to my promise, I will endeavor to lay before you our present circumstances. The English minister lodged complaint at our last August court against Mr. Streiter, and con-

tested his official character by raising a question with reference to his ordination; but at least so much was allowed to Mr. Streiter, that if he could show that he was lawfully ordained, he might celebrate marriages as heretofore, which was the real question at issue, but he must confine himself to the Germans and leave the English to their minister. But the English minister caused a provisional writ to be served on Mr. Streiter, upon the ground that he was not regularly called and ordained as a minister. The English minister declared publicly, in the presence of many men, that if we had or would obtain a regularly called and ordained minister, he would not prevent him, from performing marriages among the Germans, if he let the English people alone, but that he would annually contribute more toward his support than any one of our congregation gave. He has on several occasions declared this, and also told me so. When I was last at York I spoke to you of the money which was promised the deceased pastor Kraft, but I could not at that time give you certain authority for it, but I have since learned that it was thus. Two of the English wardens went to Mr. Kraft's house and asked him if he had enough to live on and how it went with him; to which they doubtless received the answer that he was in no little need. They then promised to pay him annually at Easter ten pounds from the moneys for the support of the English minister. I also informed you at that time what Mr. Dulany, the proprietor of our town, promised us with reference to the support of a minister. When we reflect upon this, in connection with what the English minister has said and what the English wardens offered Mr. Kraft, we should be encouraged to earnest efforts to secure a worthy pastor, so that we may not by negligence lose this opportunity. I also informed you that we have urged the opposition party to withdraw from Streiter and unite with us, so that we all with one accord could call a minister, who, with God's blessing, would accomplish much more in the congregation than Mr. Streiter with his contentions ever can. But Streiter learned of it and so influenced them that none of them would consent. On last Sunday the other Vorsteher and some of the

congregation sent me to Joseph Hardman to have once more a friendly talk with him about our uniting. As soon as I laid before him the reasons which should induce us to unite, he consented heartily; he said he was as tired of Streiter as any of us were, but he said it would be a shame for them to dismiss him at once in disregard of the promise they had made him; he urged that we should all accept him for one year and then at the end of the year we should all dismiss him. I answered that I would lay this proposal before the other Vorsteher and brethren of the congregation, which I did. When we came to consider this plan we said that it might be easy in this way to remove Mr. Streiter, but we also saw that if we attempted thus to remove him we would be hypocrites, and must pretend what we did not feel. We could not stain our consciences with such hypocrisy and deceit and get rid of Streiter by treachery, but we would rather pursue a direct and honest course with him. We had a good opportunity of sending to Mr. Muhlenberg an account of all these circumstances, as well as of our hope of support for a minister, and that many of the congregation desire that we should write to you as the United Ministers begging you to care for us and assist us in securing a worthy minister, and I have asked him to send us his views about the matter by the first opportunity. I would hereby also ask you to give us your good counsels as to the way in which we had best proceed so that God may be served and the congregation benefited. We comfort ourselves with the assurance of your friendly disposition toward us and of your kindly intercession for us with your brethren, as well as of your approval of our course.

From your Friend, CONRAD GROSCH,
with the approval of all the Vorsteher and of the congregation.

N. B. If the congregation becomes united, we could readily give a reasonable support to a minister, and if we should receive part of the approbation it would be so much easier.

Mr. Muhlenberg in a letter written in 1752 says of Streiter: "An indescreeet and immoral school-master, a self-authorized preacher, he began as early as 1743 to obtrude himself in the congregations at Indianfield and Old Goschenhoppen, which

however were at strife with him. Streiter came to Frederick with the pretence that he had at several times received verbal directions so to do." After the difficulties raised at Frederick about his ordination he went to Pennsylvania and was ordained by two disorderly vagabonds, Andrea and Rapp.

In 1752 there arrived at Frederick a regularly ordained, thoroughly educated and highly gifted clergyman, Rev. Bernhard Michael Hausihl. At the request of the late Hon. Brantz Mayer, of Baltimore, I endeavored to trace his course among our Lutheran congregations and Mr. Mayer gathered all possible information concerning him from his descendants, of all which matter an outline is given in Mr. Mayer's *Memoir and Genealogy of the Mayer Family*. Rev. Mr. Hausihl was born in 1727 at Heilbronn, Würtemberg; he was educated at Strasburg and ordained at Rotterdam, by the Lutheran consistory, as missionary to Nova Scotia. He was married at Rotterdam, to Sybilla Margaretha Mayer, daughter of Christopher Bartholomew Mayer of Ulm, who with his family was on his way to America. They landed early in 1752 at Annapolis, Md., where Mr. Daniel Dulany, the proprietor of Frederick, lived, and probably were induced by him to settle at that place. The deed of a lot on which to erect a church was given by Mr. Dulany May 30, 1752, and remembering his promise of aid to the congregation, we may well conclude that he directed Mr. Hausihl's attention to the vacant Lutheran congregation.

The date of Mr. Hausihl's arrival is placed by Mr. Brantz Mayer in May, 1752. It is probable that he arrived somewhat earlier. Among the Schaum correspondence is a letter from Frederick Unsuld to Rev. Mr. Schaum, of date March 20, 1752, from which we make the following extract: "The condition of our congregation was never so bad in all the time I have lived here as now. The bond of love is utterly broken, by reason of the carnal friendship between Streiter's party and some of the members of our congregation. That party seems externally to hold well together and has drawn the larger part of our members to itself, the result of which is the destruction of the true peace of the congregation; all of which Rev. Mr. Hausihl will communicate personally to you. Although we have used

all possible means to restore peace no good results have been attained."

From this letter it would appear that Mr. Hausihl was at Frederick in March, and had conferred with the congregation and was sent with this letter to their counsellor Mr. Schaum. It is of course possible that there is an error in the date, but it is at least very clearly given in the letter as March 20, 1752.

It would seem that some difficulties, arising either from the distracted condition of the congregation, or from the uncertain relation of Mr. Hausihl to the Pennsylvania ministers, or from both, prevented for a time the acceptance and settlement of Mr. Hausihl as pastor of the congregation. A letter from Frederick Unsuld and Conrad Grosch, of date Dec. 12, 1752, taken by Mr. Hausihl to Mr. Schaum, asks for a final counsel and decision from him and the United Ministers with reference to Mr. Hausihl's remaining and serving them as pastor, and promises that the congregation will abide by their decision. We learn from a letter of Mr. Muhlenberg (*Halle Reports*, p. 635,) that he was accepted as pastor on trial, and on condition that he should enter into union with the Pennsylvania Ministers. We conclude that from March 1752 he ministered to the congregation and that he became its pastor about the beginning of 1753.

In a letter to Mr. Schaum, July 21, 1754, asking advice as to the right to vote of a turbulent member, bitterly opposed to the pastor, which shows that he was not yet in a bed of roses, he spells his name, Hausihl. In Mr. Dulany's deed it is spelt Housel. In the *Halle Reports* it is spelt Hausil, Hausile, Hausihl; among his Anglicized descendants it became Houseal.

Of Mr. Hausihl's ministry at Frederick from March 1752 to Dec. 1758, few sources of information have been found. It would appear from Dr. Diehl's statement that he made no entries in the church record; afterward at Reading he entered in the admirably arranged church record of Trinity Church only his baptisms; of his ministry at Easton there are no records; those of the church at New York were consumed by fire. Few men of such eminence have made the historian's research so difficult. We learn from the *Halle Reports*, pp. 656, 678, that in 1754

he was in charge and in fraternal union with the Pennsylvania Ministers. His ministry here closed early in Dec. 1758, and on the third Sunday in Advent he took charge of Trinity Church at Reading, Pa., where he remained until Dec. 1763, when he removed to Easton, Pa., where he tarried but a short time. His movements for several years after this are not fully known to us: he was in Philadelphia for a time in 1765 and was used by dissatisfied members of St. Michael's Church in an attempt to form a separate congregation. This movement separated him from the Pennsylvania Ministers and thenceforth they never mention him in their reports. About the year 1770 he became pastor of the old Dutch Lutheran church in New York, where he preached in Dutch, German, and English. He continued in charge until the British evacuation of the city in 1783. He was one of the Governors of the New York College and one of the corporators of the New York Hospital. He took stand as a zealous supporter of the crown and at the declaration of peace found it advisable to withdraw with the loyalist refugees. He endeavored to induce such of his congregation as were loyal to the king to accompany him to Halifax. After his arrival in Nova Scotia, in order to secure support as a missionary of the society for the propagation of the Gospel, he went to London in 1785 and was ordained by the Bishop of London. After his return he labored as German Missionary pastor of the Lutheran church at Halifax until his death, March 9, 1799. His children attained no little social eminence. Two sons were surgeons in the British Navy and a third was an Aid to the Duke of Kent, two daughters married officers in the British Navy, four married officers in the royalist forces, and the youngest married Capt. Wm. Seymour, a nephew of the Duke of Somerset. The loyalty of the family was well rewarded. I have written thus much of the first resident pastor of the Lutheran church at Frederick, because he was a man of ability and worth, whom first his unwise attempt at Philadelphia, and afterward his difference with his brethren in relation to the independence of the American colonies, estranged from the other pastors and threw outside the view of our records.

In November 1758, Mr. Muhlenberg says, (Halle Reports, p.

734, that the officers of the congregation sent a messenger to him begging him to come to them and counsel them in a weighty matter deeply affecting the welfare or injury of the congregation. He could not come at that time, but in December they again sent a messenger urging again that he should come. He says, p. 735, that he could not get rid of him until he consented to accompany him. He had been sick and took Dr. Martini along on his journey. They rode three days in rain and snow and on the fifth day arrived at Frederick. "I inquired what had led them to such urgent pressure for my coming and learned the state of the case as follows :

1. We, the German residents of Maryland are required by law to pay an annual tax for the support of the English minister of the High Church in the Province. We derive no benefit from it as we have no need of English if we wish to hold fast to our language and religion, establish churches and schools out of our own means, and support ministers and school-masters out of our scanty earnings. It is also very difficult to find good ministers and stewards, and to control a congregation consisting of voluntary members, for here all are equals. When, in addition, disputes arise, one runs here, another there, and falls into unbelief or superstition. Our children are ashamed of the religion of their parents, and unite, when it turns out best, with the High Church.

2. The English minister of the province has recently died ; would it not be possible to petition the high authorities, that either, *a.*) the tax should be remitted in the case of the German Lutherans, or, *b.*) that a German minister should be supported by their part of tax, or, *c.*) that a minister should be appointed who should serve both the English and the Germans.

3. We desired to ask you whether you would accept such a call, as county minister, and serve both the English and the Germans ; or if you could give us good counsel and plead our cause with the authorities ?

I answered, the first point is well known to me. With regard to the second, I will gladly do what little lies in my power, but I do not believe that you will be freed from the tax ; for such constitutional provisions, or established laws, are not readily al-

tered, and you cannot find either an English or a German minister who can attend to both, not to speak of the serious hindrances.

As to the third point, I beg you not to think of me, for I have calls enough in and outside of Pennsylvania. But if I can aid you with counsel or intercession I will gladly do so.

On Saturday evening several elders of the English church came and begged me to preach on the following day in their church. The German Reformed church also sent word that their minister and church council offered me their church for our service, since the Lutherans had as yet no church. I then visited our minister and asked him whether I might preach with his full consent, of which he assured me, and regretted that he could not be present as he must hold service in a country congregation. On Sunday I preached in the morning in the English and in the afternoon in the Reformed church to large assemblages.

On Monday evening a number of magistrates and other officers came to my lodging place, thanked me for the English sermon and inquired whether I was disposed to become their county minister and preach in both languages? I answered that I had already more than I could do. They informed me that the annual income of the county service was 600 colonial pounds, but that the Government had under consideration the division of the parish and the formation of two, and that it was possible that an English and a German minister might be appointed, who should labor unitedly and establish a lovely harmony between the English and German inhabitants. If I would consent to be one of them, they would at once prepare a petition and send it to-morrow by an express to the Governor. I again begged them to have no reference to me, but entreated them to say a good word to the Governor for my German brethren in the faith, which they heartily promised to do, and the day following fulfilled their promise. I also promised to secure the influence with the Governor of some good friends in Philadelphia. I have since learned that it is really proposed that regular Lutheran and Reformed ministers shall receive an annual contribution to be paid out of the parochial tax. If this

is done and is rightly applied for the honor of Christ and the saving of souls, I shall not regret my weary journey."

The visit of Mr. Muhlenberg, which lasted three days was just before Mr. Hausihl left for Reading and there was much anxiety about securing a successor. But unfortunately a long delay was to occur before they could be supplied. For five years they were dependent on occasional visits and without a settled pastor. During this period we find the following data in the Halle Reports: Aug. 1761, they again earnestly besought Mr. Muhlenberg to become their pastor, p. 948; Sept. 30, 1761 an elder from Frederick visited Mr. Muhlenberg to confer about the vacant congregation, p. 872; Nov. 25, 1761, the call to Frederick was offered by Mr. Muhlenberg to Rev. J. C. Hartwig, p. 875, but he had little desire to accept it, though in the following June he visited the place and consecrated the church. Dr. Diehl says that the congregation then renewed the call, but he declined it. In Dec., 1762, Mr. Muhlenberg writes that in and around Fredericktown were large and small congregations, vacant for several years, which at the annual synodical meetings had earnestly begged for laborers and offered to pay the costs of the voyage of one from Germany, p. 953.

At some time in 1763, before Oct., Rev. John Samuel Schwerdfeger became pastor, as at the meeting of Synod held Oct. 18, Rev. Gerock reported (Halle Reports, p. 1130) that Mr. S. had not yet received a regular call from the Frederick congregation and asked if he should write one and have it signed by the congregation and submitted to the ministerium for approval, which was ordered.

We learn from a document preserved in the Archives at Halle, written by Superintendent Lerchen, of Neustadt, dated Feb. 27, 1755, that Mr. Schwerdfeger was educated at the Charity School at Neustadt an der Aisch, then in Brandenburg, now in Bavaria. This school was established, by the enlargement of the town school, under the auspices of Abbot Steinmetz of Kloster Berg, Superintendent, and Inspector Sarganeck of Halle, Rector, in 1731. It was a charity school for poor boys, who were gathered from the adjacent Bradenberg and Suabia and also from Silesia, Saxony and Thuringia. In 1738 a large building was

erected by voluntary gifts, in 1745 it had eight teachers under the Rector, Jno. Balth Dörfler. Against the advice of his superiors Schwerdfeger left the school and attended juridical and theological lectures at Erlangen. He then wandered about until he fell into the hands of the emigration agents who brought him to Holland and shipped him to the Patapsco, where he would have been sold into service for his passage money. He was redeemed by the opponents of Rev. Mr. Schaum at York and brought to that place to serve them as pastor, (Halle Reports, p. 646). He was ordained by some persons who were not connected with the ministerium, served the discontents at York, and had several small congregations in the neighborhood not yet belonging to the Ministerium. So Dr. Henry M. Muhlenberg says in his Diary. It is probable from the language of Dr. Muhlenberg, that the persons who ordained him were Revs. J. C. Stœver and Tobias Wagner, since Muhlenberg says they claimed to be more orthodox Lutherans than those of the Ministerium. He wrote a letter from York, dated Jan. 30, 1754, to a student of theology in Germany, in which he speaks in an offensive manner of Pastor Schaum and classifies the Lutherans at York as Sadducees, Pharisees, Halle Pietists, and Old Lutherans, of which last class he counts himself. This letter came into the hands of superintendent Lerchen who sent it to Halle.

It was in 1753 that he arrived at York, where in 1754 he baptized a child of Rev. Mr. Bager as is recorded in the Conewago Church-Book; in 1758 he became pastor of the church at New Holland where he remained until the end of April 1763. He was admitted into the Ministerium as an ordained minister June 28, 1762, presenting his Latin testimonials from Europe attested by Dr. Ziegenhagen; these testimonials must have been from the school at Neustadt or from Erlangen, as he was not ordained in Europe, and could scarcely have been accepted there as candidate, but his ordination in Pennsylvania, which Muhlenberg in his diary says, was "by ministers not in friendly relation with us, "must nevertheless have been recognized as valid. He was married at New Holland, to Dorothea Schwab, daughter of an elder of the church, and entered in the church record the baptism

of two of his children, the entries being in Latin. He went to Frederick at some time between May and October 1763, and was pastor there until 1768 when he made a visit to Europe.

When in London he made complaint to Rev. Jno. Gust. Burgman, pastor of the Savoy church in 1768, that the European collections were not properly divided and applied in America. This complaint pastor Burgman reported to H. M. Muhlenberg. It is probable that this had some connection with his leaving the domain of the Pennsylvania congregations on his return and removing to Albany. On his return he went again to Frederick, where he was at the time the Synod met in 1770, but the congregation did not desire to receive him again, claiming that he had given up his call before going to Europe, and they had given a call to Mr. Krug of Reading. The proceedings of the Synod in 1770, given in full in *Nova Acta Historico-Ecclesiastica*, Vol. XII. pp. 337-351, are largely occupied with the affairs of the Reading and Frederick congregations and those of Revs. Krug and Schwerdfeger. During Mr. Schwerdfeger's visit to Europe, Rev. C. Hartwig acted as pastor for eight months from December 1768, but was too restless to tarry longer, going to Winchester, Va. Dr. Diehl has been led by Dr. Pohlman into the error of writing that Mr. Hartwig's first charge was in New Jersey. He received from Dr. Kränzer in London a call to Rhinebeck and East Camp, N. Y., where he located in 1746 on his arrival, as his own letters show, *Acta Hist. Eccles.* XV.

Mr. Schwerdfeger did not remain in Frederick but went, soon after the meeting of Synod, to Albany, N. Y., which had applied to Synod for a pastor, where he remained until 1783 or 1784, when he removed to Feilstown near Albany where he died about 1787, having assisted in the formation of the N. Y. Ministerium in 1786.

After long discussion it was decided that Rev. John Andrew Krug should accept the call to Frederick. He preached his farewell sermon at Reading on Easter Sunday 1771, and removed immediately thereafter; he had visited and administered the communion in 1770. Mr. Krug was born in Saxony, educated at Halle, ordained at Weringerode as missionary to Pennsylvania, arrived at Philadelphia April 1, 1764, and settled as pastor at

Reading, Easter, Apr. 22; in the same year, Oct. 21, 1764, a regular call as pastor at Reading and vicinity was forwarded to him by Muhlenberg, Halle Reports, p. 1177. He was much esteemed and the church record contains a warm expression of their attachment to him when he left. At Frederick he spent the remainder of his life. Mr. Krug was an earnest, sincere, godly man of an humble spirit, and for many years labored acceptably to the congregation, but in later years some active opponents embittered his life. In 1783 a letter from some members of the congregation was presented to the Synod expressing their dissatisfaction with him and asking that he be sent to some other place. In 1789 they again presented an application for a new pastor; at a special conference they had been promised that other provision would be made for the pastor and congregation at the meeting of Synod. Lewisburg, Pa., was proposed as a location for Mr. Krug. In 1790 it was reported that an election had been held at which 90 members voted for the retention of Mr. Krug and only 22 against it. In 1791 letters for and against him were received, when the Synod sent the following answer to the congregation: "Notwithstanding that the Ministerium is not persuaded, from all the circumstances presented by both parties, of any unfitness of pastor Krug for his office, either as to doctrine or life, but is ready at all times to bear testimony to his indisputable faithfulness and integrity as well as to his profound knowledge of the doctrines of our most holy faith; nevertheless, it cannot, out of regard to the distracted congregation, as well as to the manifest physical infirmities of the brother in question, refrain from earnestly advising a change. The Ministerium promises to assist in the matter whenever a door may be opened, and considers it the duty of pastor Krug even to seek such opportunity, and when it presents itself, to accept it out of love to the kingdom of God. It also entreats the whole beloved congregation and each of the sadly alienated parties, for the love of Christ, on whom the congregation is founded, to bear with one another in love, to aid the Ministerium in its efforts, and until they can be accomplished, not to wound either the worthy pastor, or one another. It is also said that active measures are in prospect for the attainment of the de-

sired end." The strife however was not ended, for in 1792 renewed appeals were presented, when the Ministerium advised that all parties unite in the election of another of its member as pastor. In 1793 letters from the congregation and from Rev. Nicholas Kurtz, senior of the Ministerium, who had visited them, stated that no union of the parties had been effected. A committee, of which Hon. Fred. Aug. Muhlenberg was chairman, was appointed to consider the case and give advice. They proposed: "That the members who are not in favor of Mr. Krug be advised to select another pastor who should serve them and the adjacent congregation, and Cand. Wichterman was suggested, but that he or anyone who may be called should be sharply enjoined to live in the utmost attainable peace and friendship with pastor Krug." In 1794 the proceedings of Synod state that a letter from Mr. Wichterman showed that he had visited Frederick, but was not favorably received, and he had settled at East Camp, N. Y. In 1795 Mr. Krug reports for the charge, Baptisms 189, confirmed^a 25, communed 300, and a German school at Frederick of 40-50 scholars, but he stated that many parents sent their children to the English schools. Mr. Krug died May 30, 1796, and was buried beneath the aisle of the church. At the ensuing meeting of Synod, it was resolved that Rev. Dr. H. E. Muhlenberg of Lancaster deliver at Frederick a discourse in memory of pastor Krug, and that Revs. Goering and Melsheimer accompany him thither. The Synod was anxious to do honor to the memory of a loving, gentle and faithful pastor, whose latter years had been disturbed by the bitter opposition of a factious minority of the members of his charge. Mr. Krug was married Oct. 8, 1772, to Henrietta, daughter of Rev. J. F. Handschuh, who bore him four children and survived him dying in 1822.

Rev. Charles Frederick Wildbahn succeeded Mr. Krug as pastor, having charge from Dec. 4, 1796, to June 4, 1798. Mr. Wildbahn had been school-master at Conewago and removed to Winchester, Va. Mr. Hartwig visited Winchester after the consecration of the church at Frederick, and finding them without a pastor, probably advised the licensure of their school-master; at least he gave him a recommendation to Mr. Muhlenberg

asking that license be granted him to perform ministerial acts until the next meeting of Synod. Mr. Wildbahn applied July 8, 1792, to Muhlenberg with this testimonial and one from Provost Wrangel, (*Halle Reports*, p. 913). It is probable that a license as catechet was granted as he served as pastor at Winchester in 1762, but in the following year was driven away by the inroads of the Indians and returned to Conewago. In 1763 a delegate from Conewago applied to the Synod for a pastor and, if none could be found, asked that license be granted Mr. Wildbahn. License was granted to catechet and school-master Wildbahn to preach, baptize and, in case of need, administer communion to the sick under the care of the pastor at York, (*Halle Reports*, p. 1129). He was afterward examined and ordained by a committee of the Ministerium, p. 1412. He was pastor of congregations in the vicinity of Hanover from 1763 until April 1782 when on the 28th he preached his introductory sermon as pastor of Trinity church, Reading, and remained until Nov. 23, 1796. On leaving Frederick he went to Virginia, and in 1790 to some congregations in Berks Co. Pa., in 1802 was at Gwynedd. In 1804 his death was reported to Synod.

A letter from the congregation to Synod in 1798 states that Mr. Wildbahn having resigned, they had extended a call to Rev. Charles Aug. Gottl. Storck of N. C. and they ask to be supplied by visits until they obtain a pastor; Dr. Storck did not accept the call.

From Dec. 1, 1799, to June 1, 1802, John Frederick Möller was pastor. He was born March 5, 1773 at Grandenz, then in Poland, now in Prussia, student at the University of Königsberg and came to America in 1796. Where he obtained his ministerial authority is not known. There is no record in the proceedings of the Ministerium of his licensure. His name appears in the list of members first in 1803 as a licensed candidate, though in 1801 his name is given in the parochial table in connection with the report of the Frederick charge, and in 1802 permission is given that he visit Chambersburg; in 1805 he was ordained. In July, 1802, he removed to Chambersburg where he lived for 27 years; in the fall of 1829 he became pastor at Somerset, O., where he died Sept. 1833. His whole life in the

ministry bore testimony to his sincerity and devotion to his work, and he was beloved and esteemed wherever he lived.

When Mr. Møller went to Chambersburg, the last pastor at that place, Rev. Frederick William Jasinsky, came to Frederick in July 1802, though he came directly from Shepherdstown, Va., where he had been for a very short time. Dr. Diehl gives an interesting and forcible sketch of the man. He had been irregularly ordained by some irresponsible person and when he applied for reception into the Ministerium in 1789 and again in 1792, he was refused admission. He was then living in Cumberland Co. Pa. In 1798 he was at Jonestown, Lebanon Co. In 1799 he again applied, when it was resolved that if he submitted to an examination and renounced his irregular ordination, he might receive license as a candidate. To these conditions he submitted and was licensed at that time, and in 1804 he was ordained. His first charge after licensure was at Chambersburg, but he was not accepted by two of the country congregations, and the others could not make up his salary, and in 1801 he went to Shepherdstown. At the meeting of Synod in 1802, Reading and Frederick were vacant and it was decided to propose Mr. Jasinsky for Reading and Rev. John Grobb for Frederick, but the delegate from Frederick absolutely refused his consent and insisted that Mr. Jasinsky be allowed to accept the call given him by the congregation at Frederick, which was at last granted. He continued at Frederick until 1807, when he went to St. Peter's and Zion's churches, Chester county, Pa., where he died, July 15, 1815, and was buried in St. Peter's churchyard.

Some personal conflict between him and one of the members, Mr. Zieler, was examined before Synod in 1806, but the parties were reconciled, at least for the time. In 1807, letters from Loudon, Va., and Woodsboro', express their satisfaction with him, but complaints from Frederick were examined, and it appeared that for several years a smothered strife had existed between some of the members and the pastor, and that all parties, the pastor, his friends, his opponents, and the country congregations which upheld him, agreed that the unity and peace of the charge could best be established by securing another

pastor and a peaceable one. To this Mr. Jasinsky and his friends agreed on condition that he be enabled to take leave in a suitable manner. Such suitable mode would be, that at the end of his year he preach a farewell sermon and remain in the parsonage till Aug. 1, receive his promised salary and a testimonial of unblamed doctrine and life from the church council. To this arrangement all agreed.

At a meeting of the Ministerium in 1808 a letter from Frederick was presented which stated that they had extended a call to David Frederick Schaeffer, and asked that a license, as candidate, be given for the congregations. The request was granted and he took charge July 17, 1808. He had received license as candidate in 1807, and had labored as assistant to his father, having special charge of the Whitplain congregation, Montgomery county, Pa. In 1808 his license was renewed and the Frederick charge described as its sphere, which was usually defined in the license. He had charge at first of the four congregations, Frederick, Woodsboro', Crügerstown, and Loudon Co., Va., one of which he ceased to care for in 1810; in the first year he confirmed 200 persons. In 1812 he was ordained. He continued as pastor until not long previous to his death, which occurred May 5th, 1837. As Dr. Diehl has given a full and appreciative sketch of his character and record of the labors of his ministry, and as this outline is intended chiefly to be supplementary to his article, except in so far as is necessary to maintain its continuity, we will not enlarge here on the life and labors of the man who held the most important place in the ranks of the successive pastors at Frederick.

Rev. Simeon W. Harkey, D. D., succeeded him and filled the pastorate from Feb. 19, 1837, to Aug., 1850. In 1851 Rev. George Diehl, D. D., became pastor, and after the lapse of 32 years retains that position.

The *first church building* was of logs and was purchased or erected in 1743. It was also used for the school of the congregation. It was probably used for both purposes until 1762, and afterward as a school-house. It stood on the ground afterward occupied by the parsonage.

The *Second Church Building* stood on a lot conveyed to trus-

tees for the use of the congregation by Daniel Dulany, Sr., May 30, 1752, with the condition that a church should be erected on it within five years. About 1753 the erection of a church was commenced, to be of stone and 45 feet square, and the erection continued until the walls were about 6 feet above the ground when the troubles preceding and attending the Indian war stopped its progress. The condition on which the deed was made not having been fulfilled, a confirmatory deed was given by Daniel Dulany, Jr., Aug. 21, 1758, and in the following year work was resumed and the building placed under roof. the church was consecrated by Rev. John C. Hartwig, on the second Sunday after Trinity, June 20, 1762. It was however unplastered within, without floor, having mere foot boards to the seats, and paved aisles, apart from which the ground appeared, until in 1801 when it was completed internally, and the tower and spire were erected. In 1825 the north end was taken down and 25 feet added to the length, the interior and front remodeled. In 1854 one-half the building was removed and the present church was erected. In 1867 the Sunday School and lecture rooms were enlarged to the dimensions of 42 by 68 feet, of two stories. It is proposed in the anniversary year of Luther's birth to take measures for the erection of a memorial chapel for week-day services and for the uses of the Sunday-school.

ARTICLE IV.

LUTHER AND LOYOLA—THEIR INFLUENCE ON MEN.

By ALFRED A. MITCHELL, ESQ., New York, N. Y.

The 16th century produced two men, whose teachings have deeply affected the interests of human society. Diametrically opposed to each other, Luther and Loyola have been struggling for the mastery of the world. Each has met success and failure, and while no thoughtful man can deny the truth of Luther's principles or doubt their ultimate success, we must acknowledge that for three hundred years the teachings of Luther's great opponent, Ignatius de Loyola have had a strong hold over the actions and consciences of millions of men. Never have the teachings of these men had a deeper interest than at present. To-day when civilization is taking such great strides forward, nations can not long hesitate in choosing which of these leaders they will follow, when framing their principles of government. France, England, Germany and the United States have chosen. The other nations of the world, if they would claim a place in the front ranks in the march of progress, can not long hesitate. When this is the case, men must study the effect of the teachings of these two men, and choose whom they will follow.

Let us consider here, not the personal influence of these men, but rather the power and influence of the principles of which they stand as the exponents.

The Reformation was the revolt against the world-church. It was the beginning of individualism. It said that the man, and not the church, must be answerable for his actions. It placed conscience above the dogma of the church. No man must dictate another's belief, but each must choose what he will believe and for his actions he alone is responsible to God. The Reformation arraigned at the bar of reason and of the teachings

of the Scriptures, the dogmas and practices of the Catholic Church, accepted what was good and rejected what was bad.

It was the uprising of all that is good and noble in man's nature against the corrupt practices and teachings of the times. It was the longing of the soul of man to find a firm foundation on which to stand. The Church gave them only an outward form of religion, and a corrupt and licentious form at that. Man wanted something more, and this want the principles and teachings of Luther supplied.

The Germans are Protestants by nature. They have always preferred the substance to the form, the reality to the show. Tacitus tells us that they regarded the gods as too great to dwell in temples made by hands, or to be represented by graven images. Such a people could not rest in a religion of ordinances and mechanisms; they must worship God in person and not by proxy. Through former centuries, the monasteries and convents had afforded an outlet for religious longings, but now the priests were themselves more corrupt than the people; so this refuge was taken from them. For over a century, there had been an open demand for reform. To satisfy this demand the Councils of Constance, 1415, and Basel 1431, had been called, but they were so constituted that the Popes were able to defeat the reform projects and thus postpone the Reformation. The final blow was given when John Tetzel entered Germany and began to hawk his indulgences in the cities. This was no new custom, but it now struck Luther's mind in all its horror, and he denounced the custom in his ninety-five theses. This was the beginning of the Reformation. From that day, Oct. 31st, 1517, the principles there stated spread and grew and took root in the hearts of men, until to-day millions throughout Christendom hold them as their dearest right.

Luther taught freedom in religion: a man is responsible to God alone for his actions. He taught that God alone has power to forgive sin; that no man has a right, even in God's name, to pronounce absolution for sin committed. He struck a deadly blow at the priesthood, when he declared that the priest was not the necessary medium of communication between God and man, but was only necessary as the guide and helper to such com-

munication. This was a complete reversal of the existing order of things; it made the individual layman the ecclesiastical sovereign as well as the ecclesiastical subject and dethroned the Pope. He taught the idea of Freedom and the inherent rights of man. To men believing in an equality before God, it was an easy thing to pass from that, in thought, to an equality before their earthly ruler, and with that thought firmly fixed in their minds, to demand boldly such equality. Another step in advance led men to question why a man in all physical respects like themselves, should rule them, without their consent, and without consulting their interests. Such reasoning would soon destroy the theory of "the divine right of kings," and substitute for it the sovereignty of the people.

Was it not the influence of the teachings of Luther and Calvin that led George Buchanan to declare that "the will of the people is the only legitimate source of power?" Was it not due to the same influence that in our own Declaration of Independence, it is declared "that all men are created free and equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to receive these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, that whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter it, and to institute a new government?" It was this inherent idea of equality in temporal affairs, deduced from their equality in spiritual affairs which led to the constitutional struggle in England, to the American Revolution, and was the power which caused the tremendous upheaval of the French Revolution. So the principles of Luther, logically followed out, lead to the freedom of the individual in religion and politics, and to the equal rights of all before God and man.

The formation of the company of Jesus was the result of the Catholic reaction against the principles of the Reformation. Luther nailed up his theses in 1517. It was in 1534 that Loyola and his six companions bound themselves together by solemn vows, but it was not until 1540 that the society was recognized by the Pope. It would be unfair and partisan to say

that these men, and especially Loyola, their leader, were not actuated by what they sincerely believed to be good motives. Some will say that it is unfair to hold Loyola responsible for all that has been said and done by the Jesuits from 1540 to 1883; yet the history of the period during which he held the generalship of the society, the elaborate mechanism of the society itself, which is the production of his brain solely, and the works which he has left, would warrant this, even without the statements of the Jesuits themselves, that their society has not changed in the least degree, either in constitution or in its views and plans, from the time when Loyola began his work.

While Luther is looked upon as the representative of Protestantism, of liberal ideas and individual freedom, Loyola must be regarded as the champion of the idea of the universal church of ecclesiastical despotism, of the submission of the many to the will of one, of the destruction of individualism and the merging of one's self and one's desires into the general mass, subordinate to one man, the Pope of Rome.

The early services of the Jesuits were undoubtedly productive of good. The missionary zeal with which they began, had the true ring of Christianity in it. While they lived pure, self-sacrificing lives, their influence was for good. But the institution which they were defending was so full of faults, that one of two things must reform it and lift it to their level, or they must sink to its level and be absorbed in its vices. History shows that the latter took place. A spirit of worldliness, a greed for power, a spirit of hypocrisy, of intrigue and of casuistry, came upon them, and their influence turned against the progress of liberty and the march of ideas.

The three principles in their teachings which have aroused the great opposition against them, may be stated to be the doctrines of Mental Reservations, Probabilism and Justification of Means by Ends.

It is impossible in this paper to consider these subjects fully. They can simply be outlined.

The "probable opinion" has been defined to be "any opinion resting on some really grave motive, though with few of the opposite," which means that, notwithstanding an irrepressible

inward impression that truth is really in opposition to a given "opinio probabilis," yet any opinion, in behalf of which there can be adduced what is technically called a "grave motive" may be safely taken as full warrant for action. Probable opinion is declared to be a sufficient justification to conscience for any action. The Jesuit Doctor Gury declares that the opinion of a man of "learning and uprightness" is "assuredly probable" for his own guidance, if only "he should be conscious of having thought it out diligently," and persuaded himself of its correctness: for the general good, one single author "of exceptional superiority" can render probable any opinion he may express "even if his teachings be contrary to what is commonly held:" for an ignorant man to be able to point to the opinion of any one whom he considers learned, is enough to warrant his acting in accordance with such opinion.

The Jesuit doctrine of Mental Reservation may be simply summed up as follows: One need not feel bound by any oath or statement, if only he has made a mental reservation to the contrary at the time the oath was taken. Father Gury says that no oath, according to more probable opinion, is binding "if made with the intention indeed of swearing, but not of binding," and he adds that "the binding force of an oath has to be interpreted according to the tacit conditions, either included or implied therein, which are: 1st, if I could have done so without grave injury to myself; 2nd, if matters had not notably changed; 3rd, if the rights and will of the superior were not contrary; 4th, if the other had kept his faith; 5th, if the other does not waive his right. Considering only the first condition, it will be seen that any one can repudiate his oath whenever he sees fit, by simply stating that he can not keep it without grave injury to himself; and moreover, each is made his own judge of what is grave injury to himself.

The last of the three most objectionable doctrines taught by the Jesuits is that of Justification of Means by Ends. This doctrine holds that, when the end aimed at is good, any means may be used to bring about that end, even if those means, considered by themselves, are bad, since the end for which they are used, being good, makes them good. The Jesuits themselves

have never ceased to deny this charge, but the fact is proved by the writings of the greatest doctors. The phrase used by them all is "*Cum finis est licitus, etiam media sunt licita.*" One of them puts it plainly, thus: "Is the intention of a good end rendered vicious by a choice of bad means? Not if the end itself be intended irrespective of the means;" and explains his proposition thus: "*Caius is minded to bestow alms, without, at the time, taking thought as to the means, subsequently from avarice, he elects to give them out of the proceeds of theft, which to that end he subsequently commits.*" This same author says "*Finis determinat probitatum actus.*"

It can not be denied that it was due to the efforts of the Jesuits that the progress of the Reformation was stopped and prevented from taking a firm and permanent hold upon France, Spain, Austria and Italy, such as it had taken on the countries of Northern Europe, Germany, England and Sweden. The middle of the 16th century saw the Protestant Reformation triumphant, not only over northern Europe, but over a part of southern Europe, which is now Catholic. Bohemia was then Protestant, through the influence of John Huss and Jerome of Prague. The greater part of Austria had accepted the Reformation. In Switzerland the people had listened to Zwingli's preaching and had deserted the Church of Rome. From Geneva the Huguenot doctrine had spread over France, and counted fully one-third of the inhabitants of that country among its adherents. Catholicism was confined to Spain and Italy and to France. During the next century came the Catholic reaction. Ferdinand II. of Austria, came forward as the champion of Catholicism. The Pope recognized the power which Loyola and his followers could be to the papal chair and encouraged them in their undertakings.

The tactics used by the old religious orders, the Benedictines, Franciscans, and Dominicans were antiquated, their philosophy was rejected by the new learning of the Renaissance, and there was need of new weapons, if the Catholic Church was to fight the Reformation. The Jesuits filled this gap. The requirements of the case made their constitution very different from those of the older religious orders. Those had withdrawn from

the world and adopted a life of contemplation. The time for such ideas was past; the world was awake and demanded activity in the men who should attempt to mould its thought and direct its action. The Jesuits met this by enjoining on their members, not retirement from the world, but mingling among men. Loyola forbade his followers to wear a dress distinctive of their order, and directed them to appear in civilians dress whenever it would aid their plans. By mingling in social intercourse among the people, and by teaching the young, he hoped to obtain for his society an influence over men that would enable it to control them.

In explaining his plan to Pope Paul III., Loyola described the older religious orders as the infantry of the Church, whose duty it was to stand firm and immoveable in one place, whereas the Jesuits should be the Catholic light horse, ready to meet the enemy at whatever point they should threaten the Church. This was a good description, and such the Jesuits have been.

Time is required to show the effect that any movement or doctrine will have on mankind. Surely enough time has elapsed to show the respective effects of the teachings of Luther and Loyola. If we compare the condition, morally, socially and politically, of the people of the United States and that of the Spaniards, we shall obtain a comparison of these results. The United States and Spain are mentioned simply as examples. It would serve as well to say England and Italy, Germany and Portugal, Sweden and Austria.

The Protestant religion, irrespective of the sects into which it is divided, teaches men to think and act for themselves. It teaches man responsibility; it teaches him that he has a share in the state; it teaches him his duty, to himself and to his neighbor, on the basis of the one book which all Christians recognize as inspired—the Bible. The Scriptures are open to all, each must search them and interpret them as his conscience directs him, and for his interpretation he need answer to no man, but to God alone. This throws all the responsibility on the individual. History and experience show us that if we would develop strength of character in a man, depth of thought and purpose, we must impress him with an idea of his responsibility.

Under such circumstances a man's ambition is aroused, his honor is involved; he is rendered circumspect, cautious, he calculates the consequences which will follow his action, before he steps forward in a new enterprise. These are the characteristics of a progressive nature. In such a state, where men recognize their individual responsibility, there will be no hasty revolutions, no visionary schemes, no bigotry, no impulsive beginnings and sudden endings, national laziness or shirking of work, but rather deep-seated earnestness, perseverance and thought.

It will not do to say that this difference of character between Englishmen and Germans on the one hand, and Spaniards and Italians on the other, is due to the difference of race and blood, for the recent history of France proves the contrary. The French are mostly Celtic in their blood, as are the Spaniards and Italians, yet they have shown themselves as capable of advancement in civilization as their Teutonic neighbors. They have shown as much steadfastness of purpose and thoroughness of conviction in their establishment of the present Republic, as the Americans in their war of Independence or the English in their revolution of 1688. These things have been brought to pass through a sense of individual responsibility.

The Jesuits on the contrary, by teaching the submission of the wills of the many to some higher power, whether it be king, pope or simple priest, have done away with this restraining and elevating influence, and have prepared the way for the play of man's unbridled passions. The many revolutions and general anarchy of Spain, where the Jesuits have long been in power, sadly prove this. There the mass of men, not having any share in the government and hence no feeling of responsibility, felt little interest in the continued existence of any particular form of government. It mattered little to them what the form of government was in which they had no share, and feeling no responsibility, they were ever ready for a new experiment.

But the political result has not been the only effect of the difference in the principles taught by Luther and Loyola; morally they are widely different. It would be untrue to charge the Jesuits with a deliberate attempt to corrupt the morals of society. Yet in their desire to obtain power and influence over

men, and to hold them securely in their grasp, they have certainly pampered man's vices and strained their moral philosophy in their attempts to excuse his actions. If we were to teach in all our schools and colleges the systems of morals which the Jesuits are teaching in their schools, and which are taken from the works of Gury, Liberatore, and other doctors of their order, what would become of honor, honesty, truth and all the other kindred virtues?

With a code of morals which commends an act of theft when the proceeds are expended in charity; which declares an oath to be not binding when "taken with the intention of swearing, but not of binding;" which holds that a mental reservation frees one from the conditions of his oath, which says that where the end is good, any means that may be used are good, even when such means include theft, falsehood, crime and even murder—when such a code as this is openly taught, what chance is there for honesty and truth?

With such a code as this, any act can be excused, and not only excused, but even defended and declared to be wholly right and proper.

All accounts of travels through the Latin countries, Spain, Portugal, Italy and even France, tell us of the light esteem in which truth is held and how wide-spread is crime. It will be claimed that this is the result of ignorance, of lack of means of education. In a certain measure this is true, but it is true, not so much to lack of means of proper education, as to the presence of immoral and bad education in the teachings of the Jesuits. In proof of this, let us call our attention to the fact of the expulsion of the Jesuits from France in 1881 on the double charge of their being traitors to the state and of corrupting the youth by their teachings. Surely when a mighty state like France finds it necessary for her internal peace and her public morality to expel the Jesuits from her territories, something must be amiss in the doctrines which these men teach!

On the other hand, what system of morals does Luther teach? He points men to the Scriptures as a guide for their conduct. He teaches that an oath is sacred, and to be kept when once

given, that honor and honesty are not empty names, but have a practical, absolute meaning, that falsehood is a disgrace to man's moral nature; that man must bridle his passions and appetites, and that there is no excuse for crime.

Socially, again, their teaching is far apart. Luther teaches that the family is the basis of the state, and the Church and the nation each one large family, the members of which are bound together by brotherly love and kindly feeling. Loyola teaches that the priesthood and the laity are different classes with distinctly marked lines of separation, the priesthood having power which the laity can not possess. He makes the priesthood an oligarchy ruling the people absolutely and ruled in turn by the Pope; thus creating an ecclesiastical despotism. Luther proclaims the right of all, the greatest and the least, to a share in the government which affects them all. In their religious teachings these men stand as wide apart as in other respects. Loyola urges men to yield their wills and consciences to the dictates of the Pope, God's vicar upon earth, and adds that by so doing they are absolved from all responsibility for their actions, since the Pope stands in God's place and whatever he commands must be right. Luther teaches that a man must be his own judge in religious matters, with the Bible for his guide, and that he is responsible to God for his opinions, that he can not transfer this responsibility or shirk it. The effects of responsibility have been dwelt on elsewhere and need not be considered again here.

Loyola proclaims a code of morals which sets up vice for virtue, falsehood for truth, deceit for honesty, which claims to be superior to king, emperor, parliament or congress; which makes itself a despotism over the hearts and consciences of men; which places its spies in every household, taking note of the actions and beliefs of every individual; trampling on all law; setting aside all authority; acknowledging only one whom they are obliged to obey—the Pope of Rome!

Luther lays before men a system of morals which admits no excuse for crime, which exalts virtue and denounces vice, which proclaims the right of every one to a share in the framing of measures which affect the common interest, which recognizes

the authority of law and the fact that all men are subject to it, which declares the freedom of the individual and which recognizes the sacredness of privacy of home.

Let us turn for a moment to what history tells us of the influence of these men on the world. The Society of Jesus has been uniformly unsuccessful in their greatest enterprises. It controlled the policy of Spain, when Spain was aiming, with good reason to hope for success, at the leadership of Europe, and Spain came out of the struggle well nigh the last among the nations. It secured the monopoly of religious teaching and influence in France under Louis XIV. and Louis XV., only to see an atheistic revolution break out under Louis XVI. and sweep over the nation after a century of such training. It guided the action of James II., lost the crown of England for the house of Stuart, and brought about the limitation of the throne to the Protestant succession. It undertook the establishment of the empire of New France in the New World, and beheld the complete overthrow of French power in America and the firm establishment of English control in Canada. Defeated in Canada, it boldly repeated its attempt to found ecclesiastical state in the territory now comprising Oregon, Washington, Idaho and Montana, and saw that country added to the union, and settled by the unmanageable Yankee, self confident and independent. Its Japanese and Red Indian missions have vanished without leaving a trace behind; its labors in Hindoostan only opened the way for the English empire there; it was swept out of its Paraguayan domains without power of defense; and having in late years concentrated its efforts on the maintenance of the temporal power of the popes and raised this almost to the rank of a dogma of the Catholic faith, it has seen Rome proclaimed as the capital of united Italy and a Piedmontese sovereign enthroned in the Quirinal; and to-day, its members are shut out from France, Germany and Switzerland.

But it has found success in some of its enterprises. It stemmed the tide of the Reformation when it was rolling over southern Europe, and saved Austria, Spain and Italy to Catholicism, and France as far as any form of religion is regarded there. Its last victory has been the promulgation of the dogma

of papal infallibility, and its acceptance by the Catholic world. It formulated the principles of the Ultramontane party and by its influence at Rome has succeeded in filling nearly every Catholic see with an upholder of their principles. It has virtually identified the interests of the whole Church of Rome with its own by this same influence. It has persistently demanded that it be entrusted with the education of the young and its persistence has won.

It has won victories, it is true, but they can only be present ones. Time will turn these seeming victories into defeats. The efforts of the Jesuits are like those of a person who attempts to dam a brook with running sand. At first he may be successful, but the stopping of the waters without an outlet, and their accumulation only gives them power eventually to burst the dam and destroy all traces of it.

The efforts of the Jesuits are to dam the stream of progress, to preserve the medieval past. Already most of their barriers have gone down and the forces are gathering which will sweep away those that still remain standing. The recent political activity in Italy and Spain bodes ill for the continuance of Jesuit control in those countries.

The nations of Europe which have accepted Luther's principles and embodied them in their public acts; Germany, England and the United States, the greater nations, Switzerland, Holland, Sweden and Denmark, the smaller ones, stand foremost in the world in political, social and moral development, while the nations where Loyola's influence has been strongest, Spain and Portugal, are the last in the list of European nations, if we exclude Turkey, which is not Christian. The Jesuit influence is strong in South America and those nations are the laggards in the march of progress.

The principles of Luther—the principles of Freedom, Truth and Justice have won their way over the despotism of rulers and the prejudices of aristocracy, and have won the grand results which modern historians record.

Luther's influence on men is uplifting, ennobling, calling forth all the higher qualities of man's nature; the influence of Loyola's teaching is to call into play man's baser passions, to excuse

and defend his vices and crimes and to make him a mere creature, obedient to his master, the Pope. The spirits of these men still live and teach, and "the end is not yet."

"O! vos qui cum Jesu ites
Non ite cum Jesuites."

ARTICLE V.

TENDENCIES.

By REV. EDWARD T. HORN, A. M., Charleston, S. C.

I understand Mr. Henry Buckle to argue in his learned and entertaining *History of Civilization in England*, that free will, as we call it, has no part in history. He excludes also supernatural interference. All events are summarily explained by him as the reciprocal action of man and nature, "man modifying nature and nature modifying man." "Variations are the result of large and general causes, which working upon the aggregate of society, must produce certain consequences, without regard to the volition of those particular men of whom the society is composed." In proof and illustration of this position, he alleges that all, even the smallest occurrences take place in abject obedience to fixed law,—so that even the same number of persons commit suicide, and the same number of persons omit to address their letters properly, every year; and he supports his allegation by appalling statistics not to be contradicted.

I understand the same general theory to be urged by other great writers, such as Matthew Arnold, whom men read for the grace and energy of their style and therefore are corrupted by their subtle teaching. These urge that each age is colored, ruled and directed in its course by a something which they call the *Zeitgeist*, which in English we might call a *tendency*, of which we speak as "the spirit of the age." It is impossible successfully to resist the spirit of the age, they say; vainly we struggle against a current; the very opposition which some men flatter themselves they make is like the ripples caused by the washing of a strong current over a stone in the shallow channel, it is itself a product, a consequence, of the spirit of the

age. They deny that the Reformation was in any sense the product of individual conscience ; Leo X. and Tetzl, they say, were natural products ; the whole was the necessary sequel to certain antecedents. The French Revolution was a later consequence of the same forces working according to fixed laws ; and Napoleon Buonaparte, the treaty of Vienna, the new German Empire, our Civil War, European emigration to America, whatever you please that has taken place, or is taking place, lay in embryo in the Reformation, and its time ; and the future which shall be lies in the present like a chicken in the egg, and you can hatch nothing else out of it ; and in this case you cannot even destroy the egg. We are what we are because certain definite antecedents produce according to fixed laws, and those fixed laws are producing from us an inevitable future. Ascertain the laws, then ; define the antecedents ; and you shall be able to prophesy.

This is a fair statement of a theory, which I propose not to combat to-day, but to recognize and consider. In its extreme and naked consequences it blots out human will ; it denies human initiative ; it declares that we are not responsible for our beliefs or for our conduct ; it says that you and I are here to-day, you listening, I uttering certain sentiments, because either the world was in the beginning wound up to produce this incident at this particular time, or because this incident is the inevitable result of the accidental jarring of the elementary atoms at the beginning, and of all the accidental jarrings which have occurred since that time. This theory derives its chief support from the doctrine of Evolution. It is characteristic of the human mind to be fascinated by a great idea. The doctrine of Evolution is a brilliant hypothesis, which, though it has not been proven, if for argument's sake you admit it has, explains nature, and does it so beautifully that the doctrine of Evolution must at once be applied to everything else, and it is found to fit everything else as well : the Philosophy of History becomes an application of the doctrine of Evolution ; a hundred and fifty Taines demonstrate that all the peculiarities of every national literature and every great author and artist, are due to physical causes ; Evolution is applied to Theology by a Newman or a

Dorner, and at the same time establishes the Immaculate Conception of Mary and the latest formulas of orthodox Protestantism; and the ingenious Bagehot has elaborated an equally satisfactory evolution of all the data of politics. Now I am not prepared to disprove, nor even to reject, the doctrine of Evolution; but I venture to hint my suspicion that it is itself a "development;" that it is not a logical conclusion from facts, but probably a product of "the spirit of the age;" that, just as Christian doctrine, as soon as it was pondered in the schools of Alexandria, the abode of Greek philosophy, had to submit to the refinements enshrined in the Creeds, and as soon as it had converted the Germanic nations had to blossom into feasts and ceremonies which belonged to their ancestors, and when they were awakened issued in Protestantism; thus, since we have newly begun to study the philosophies of India, to dream and versify about Gautama Buddha, and Nirvana and other misty nations of a theology which traces its development through infinite ages, we have been compelled by this necessary law of the human mind to review in the modern form of tailless apes and *amabæ*, etc., the cosmogony which put the world on the back of an elephant, and this on the back of a tortoise, and so on forever.

The works of Mr. Lecky are at the same time a very entertaining and a very powerful advocacy of the theory that we are controlled by the "spirit of the age." He examines the history of certain opinions, such as the general belief in witchcraft, for instance, which once were shared by the whole world, but now are not at all tolerated by the intelligent; and shows that these opinions have fallen not because they were disproved, but through decay; men no longer ask whether they had a basis; they have no patience with one who tries to prove them true; insensibly a change of opinion established itself; the spirit of the age changed and now it is impossible for a man to believe what once it was impossible to disbelieve; and he intimates that the same process of deterioration and construction of opinions is even now going on.

The theory again derives support from our fresh respect for the powers of nature. It is true that we daily are amazed by

some new application of those powers to his own uses by ingenious man; yet in his study of Physics the man of our own day has loosened his grasp of eternity, through which alone he is greater than the world; and the wonderful discoveries of Layard, Schliemann and the Egyptologists, the discovery of complete and ambitious civilizations surviving only in potsherds and scratches on the walls and hideous mummeries, make us bitterly feel that if we are only a part of nature, we are but a very little part of it, that the winds blow on, and the changeless stars watch without a thought of us, as the sands cover us, our monuments, our hopes, and our future.

There is some truth in this theory. You and I are products of the past—not like Adam, even when driven from Eden; the many inventions, the vices, the mistakes, as well as the faiths and aspirations of our ancestors live in us. The whole past and the whole present, interlaced and everlasting, influence us.

Take as an illustration the contagiousness of a sentiment. It is possible by skillful treatment to make a whole nation to be of one mind. One of the most curious subjects in the history of our late civil war is, the study of the means by which the whole North, on the one hand, and the whole South, on the other, was made to think together and to persevere hopefully when their cause seemed to the best informed most hopeless. Not only were the dispatches colored, but writers were employed and events were controlled; until at length no one dared to think differently from all the rest on his side. Take as another instance, what we call *Rationalism*. It is not strange that the combined and continued influence of skeptical writers, and the exposure of errors of popular belief should have produced widespread uncertainty; but it is strange that that influence was so combined and continued. Who would deny that the tendency in every European nation is towards self-government? The great Reformation certainly was a symptom of the *Renaissance*. But the curious instances of the *oscillations* of opinion are harder to explain than the prevalence of a tendency. Thus the revived heathenism of Rome and the free thought of Germany, which certainly got their start in the renewed study of the Greek classics, in time gave place to what we call *Romanticism*,

a delight in mediæval authors, an excessive admiration of the Ages of Faith, a tendency which begot Frederick Schlegel and Sir Walter Scott, and still survives though weakened in Modern Gothic architecture, Preraphaelism, and the Ritualism of one section of the Anglican Church. And besides the existence of such tendencies, and the evidence of a regular oscillation of opinion, we must acknowledge another law in human society, which we may call the *recoil* of opinion. Without regard to the logic on which an opinion is based, the tendency sets the other way as soon as its consequences are clearly seen to be dangerous, to contradict the fundamental innate beliefs of conscience. I think I can discern such a recoil now from the consequences of the extreme skepticism which has been prevalent. For awhile, he was considered a Philistine who dared to pray and believe; but wiser masters are rising; and I prophesy that before long even the fools will join to say, "The fool hath said in his heart there is no God."

Let us now consider the consequences of this theory, which are so grave as to justify our discussion of it to-day. It is said that dialecticians are able to attach any consequences they please to a theory they are combatting; but the consequences I allege now you may see; and they are such as the human conscience cannot tolerate, because they contradict its elementary beliefs. Logically, this theory makes us things, as helpless parts of nature as the foul things spawned in swamps. It says that all religions are equally baseless. It laughs to scorn the notion that God counts the hairs of our heads. And lest these logical consequences seem of no practical moment, consider the full blossom of it in Russian Nihilism; in the hard, deaf communism of the millions who, without faith in another life cannot bear the hardships of this. It is taught everywhere—in George Eliot's hopeless novels, in Berthold Auerbach's, on the platform, in our newspapers. It is every man's excuse. We must do as others do, all say; you cannot resist the spirit of the age. To be out of fashion, to be thought peculiar is as dreadful as of old time was heresy. One must vote with his party against conscience, and urge the wicked customs of trade against the Bible.

Every man needs to be reminded that he is a *man*, that he is above the spirit of the age.

These consequences I hold to be a refutation of the theory. We admit the facts it alleges, but the explanation it offers does not tally with other facts. Another strong objection to it is the influence certain men have exerted on the history of the world. Bishop Martensen says that those only are to be called great men through whose life the life of the world has passed and taken color from it. There have been such; but because the few examples are so familiar, I will not dwell on them. It is enough to mention Plato and Aristotle, Alexander and Cæsar, Leo the Great and Martin Luther, Sakya-Mouni and Confucius. Myriads of tendencies, perhaps, found in each of these a focus, but were refracted or transmitted or absorbed according to the great man's nature and the great man's will.

It is a mistake to think that the course of history has been uninterrupted progress. In the mounds on the banks of the Tigris, in the tombs of Egypt, in the successive layers of His-sarlik, beneath the yellow river of Rome, whole civilizations are buried. The tide is not always at high-water-mark. The folly of men may set the world back for a long time. Had not Omar burned the library at Alexandria, the dark ages might have been shortened. How often has the knife of the assassin diverted the current or quickened it. Had not every tradition of old France been rooted up in the Revolution, the dreary horrors of this unfinished century of Liberty, Fraternity and Equality might be at an end. Once and again Napoleon Buonaparte had it in his power to establish peace and order in accordance with his own genius; but when Metternich urged him to this after the retreat from Moscow, as the allied princes did again at the border of France, he sullenly said, *What are a million of lives to me?* It is easy to speak of the line of human progress as if it were single and mighty and easily discernible; but the more careful analyst discovers that it is made up of a thousand thread-like streams of human motive and human whim, of vice and weakness, of strength and faith and mistaken zeal; like the drops which ooze from a mountain-side to make a river, which rebound from the rocks, and lazily glide this way or that, and

may be deflected by your finger or dissipated by your breath. Thus one body of men look upon the hierarchy in the Roman Church as the result either of a direct inspiration or of a divinely-guided development; but another sees in it no more than in a street in London, which, interesting for what it is, is built on the heaps of a Norman ruin, which covered a forgotten Saxon village, beneath which again lie fragments of a Roman bath. The France of to-morrow might have been the noble creation of Leon Gambetta, if he had not wasted himself like Samson in the lap of Delilah. And this century will forever bear the impress of Gladstone's sense of duty and simple churchman's faith.

A brilliant example of the controlling power of the human will is related in the *Life of Lord Lawrence*, by R. Bosworth Smith. In the darkest period of the Indian mutiny, when the meagre English force before Delhi was discouraged by the incompetency of its commanders, the ravages of cholera, and the harassing attacks of a too numerous foe, Sir John Lawrence had detached from the Punjab John Nicholson with a small command as a re-enforcement. This officer was a man of marvelous personal power. He had great strength, a quick spirit, and a curiously powerful address. At one time, it is said, with the patient impatience of a savage, he had rode down a flying enemy for twenty hours over seventy miles, slaying as he rode; and many of the natives associated themselves in religious devotion to Nikkul-Seyu, as they called him, believing him a demigod. In grim humility it was his habit to flog these worshipers when they came to him; but still, when he had been killed in the assault on Delhi, some of them killed themselves too, and one bowed ever hereafter to worship only the God of Nikkul-Seyu. It is related that when he heard that a body of native troops in the Punjab had mutinied and were in full march towards the capital he set out on a headlong and seemingly hopeless pursuit. On improvised carts his men made a long distance in the night; but the full heat of a Summer sun overcame them, though they built shelters of leaves over them as they rushed along. One after another fell dead by the roadside; and at length, as they came to a tempting grove, men and offi-

cers joined to beg the unresting chieftain for a few hours of repose. Unwillingly he consented, and in a moment the tired band lay under the trees composed to sleep; when it occurred to one of the officers to ask where Nicholson himself was. The word went from mouth to mouth; and when they looked, behold, in the middle of the road, in the blazing sunlight, upright and with eager eyes, sat their chief, disdainful of the shade and chafing under the delay. Each as he looked sprang to his feet and in a moment the line was formed, on went the hurling march, to catch the foe and strike and crush in time!

What man is there of us but did not feel when the British army recently landed in Egypt that it was a shame to give the life of one of those soldiers for ten of the Bedouin? Every Englishman was a *man*, conscious of his soul, strong in his idiosyncrasies, and determined to have his way. It is the recognition of this which makes Kinglake's "History of the Invasion of the Crimea" so readable a book. He does not tell the story of the army only, but of every man in it. In the charge of the Six Hundred he tells their strokes, their shouts, as Homer did of his heroes; because each, though under law, was an independent, self-centred man.

Samuel Taylor Coleridge was a remarkable instance of spiritual power. He made an epoch, and, I think, stamped on it not merely his thought, but the sad imperfection of it. The most opposite schools of thought in England derive from him. The England of to-day would not have been if Coleridge had not revealed the deeper truth of which things seen and handled are but the expression. It was not what he said; he has not written any thorough and complete treatise; his was the wonderful power, granted to but few in so great measure, granted to many in some measure, to quicken the souls of others.

Another such man, whose name is little known, was Alexander Scott. Among the remarkable men of our time there is a group of Britons who have had no little influence on the spirit of the age. Bishop Ewing, the author of the tune of *Jerusalem the Golden*, was one. Dean Stanley was another. Erskine of Linlathen, venerated in his lifetime as a prophet, was another. McLeod Campbell, who was at war with the Scottish Church,

was another. Thomas Carlyle shared the same impulse. Edward Irving came within the magic circle. F. D. Maurice, the Christian Platonist, was another. Now, none of these are men of the first rank; but no thinker will deny the immense influence this group have had in every department, nor in how large a measure they may be said to represent the age—to make the spirit of the age. Yet all these, perhaps, would have acknowledged Alexander Scott to be their master—a man of profound insight; who wrote little and published less; and who, according to the testimony of them all, was powerful by personal influence, a source of original spiritual force, a vortex in the spiritual universe, a knot in which many of the nerves of the sympathetic system of the world centred.

John Henry Newman is another such. With unparalleled subtlety he has dissected his own spiritual life for us; but the testimony of others shows what a wonderful fascination he has always exerted. His logic is keen; each of his words is a dart; yet his power is in himself. Brought near him men were fastened to him as steel to the magnet. He carried them whither he would, even when he did not try to do so. And to-day he is the radiating centre of a whole system of most modern motives, which go to make up the spirit of the age.

Goethe was such a man, and such was Voltaire. Compare Goethe with Schiller and you see a difference which no theory of antecedents and consequents can explain. Thomas Arnold was such a man. Martin Luther was such a man. Melancthon, Bugenhagen, Jonas, Brenz, revolved around him like moons around a planet, while Erasmus, Hütten and Cajetan were equally products of the age. There have been many such in our own history. Thaddeus Stevens exercised a wonderful power over the wills of others; Aaron Burr was said to fascinate men; we know others who are able to silence even the selfishness of those they speak to; it is related that from an humble bush school in upper Carolina, presided over by such a creative genius, went forth Petigrue, MacDuffie and a host of others, who moulded the institutions of the State. Each of us doubtless owns a master; and it is probable that many look up to us with a like if not an equal veneration. It is the law of

heaven. Our Master rules and changes us by the influence of his self; and to this day transforms the world not by cut-and-dried precept, but by the marvelous influence of those who are becoming like him. *He that believeth in me, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water.*

Our view is confirmed by a survey of literature. Tragedy is the highest form of literature; and tragedy is the triumph of the human soul over the vague and apparently resistless powers of nature and society. The Cross is the symbol of the victory over the world. Even if Christ had not risen, we would know that his soul, his self, was not conquered.

In his word God addresses us as responsible creatures. If it reveals a deep purpose which goes on to fulfilment in spite of all the folly of men, it is a purpose which the folly of men may compel to start again and again. A people may be rejected with whose welfare that purpose was at one time bound; an anointed of the Lord may prove recreant as Samson did; the absolute power and godhead of the most high finds no difficulty in admitting the free choice and responsibility of all whom he has made.

When God made us in his image, he made us also *creators*. Every man makes the world he lives in; the bitter man makes the hell that plagues him; the loving man's happy eye paints the cheeks that please him. God gave to us the power to impress on things the forms of our own minds, even as he has made them the mirror of his fatherliness. It pleased him to make many millions of worlds in this one.

Having acknowledged the truth which lies in the theory we are considering, I have stated its appalling consequences, which you see and feel; I have reminded you of the innumerable proofs of the originating power of the human soul; I have shown you that men have been able to interrupt the course of tendency; I might go over the names of the few men through whom the course of the world's history has passed and been refracted; I have alluded to the testimony of literature, which is the witness of universal human consciousness, and appealed to the example and teaching of our Master and the authority of the word of God; and I submit that no such summary state-

ment as Mr. Buckle's, no arbitrary Positivism, is a fair description of our life. It is true there are great processes in the world, so old, so mighty, so general in their operation, that they appal us. It is true that every age has its own character, builds on the past, builds of the past. It is true that large tendencies of thought and feeling sweep over the world and seem to carry men along with them. But we must admit that spiritual forces are at work thus as well as physical. We must trace these forces to the books, the words, the lives, the choice of men, or to the Spirit of God who filleth the whole earth. We must recognize the fact that as a perfect universe of powers beat upon us, make our atmosphere and drive the processes of our bodies, so we are encircled and beaten upon by innumerable lines of spiritual force, augmented daily and in daily varying combinations. Nor dare we forget that each of us stands at a centre of these forces. If they beat upon us, we can resist them. If they appeal to us, we can choose and modify and use them. We are as gods. Our *moral nature* is the centre and the lasting truth.

Here I might stop; but I hold myself bound to indicate the rules of conduct to which our consideration of tendencies has led us. Three mistaken theories also call for reprobation. The first is the mistake of the old eremites, who tried to remove themselves at the same time from the influence of tendencies and from all influence on the world. Withdrawing to communion with God and pervaded by a conviction of responsibility, they yet failed to hold themselves to be sources of tendency; and therefore I join with the spirit of the age to condemn them. The second was represented by that slightly ridiculous school of New England transcendentalists, which gave us many of the foremost *literateurs* of the passing generation, Hawthorne, Theo. Parker, George Ripley and their *confreres*. Henry D. Thoreau may stand as a symbol of these. He failed in trying to influence the world (unlike St. Anthony) while he withdrew himself from all the motives of human society. Though himself the creature of an extreme tendency, he thought to make an absolutely fresh beginning from intimate communion with nature. He forgot that according to the divine constitution of the world, Abraham, the bearer of the promise, must be blessed by Mel-

chisedec, the priest of the consecrated past. And the third school, the school of our workman-socialists, whose dangerous theories confront us in every crisis, differs again in taking law from neither God nor nature. It deifies the hunger or the impulse of the moment. It despises patience. It honors not the man "just and tenacious of principle." It believes that the outcry of the multitude can make that good which is not good, can make paper into money, can overturn the laws of trade, and can change the settled convictions of thinking men into an echo of their wish.

On the other hand we are compelled to admit the existence and rightful authority of great lines of spiritual force, radiating from the countless spirits of earth and heaven and from the Father of spirits too. Plato taught that there is a world of ideas of which this world is the material form; I rather believe in a world of moral relations, which are the result of our life here. I know indeed the thousand discouragements we meet—the power of disease to color our thoughts and weaken one's discernment; the inborn limitations; the narrowness of our purview; the perplexity caused by the voices of the world; and the seeming insignificance of all that we can do. I know our will is bound until Christ frees us. Yet there are certain rules by observance of which alone we rise to manhood. The first is, recognize that you are responsible. The *second* is, remember that you are like God. If he sits at the centre of these whirling currents to rule them with high delight; so let us remember that he has given us dominion over all things. Let us examine all motives, and search until we find that purpose of the Most High which goes on to fulfillment as silently as the moth, as irresistibly as decay in wood. To this end we must hear his voice. And, after all, this is the conclusion of the matter. We must act as if we and God were alone—he on his throne, we in our stewardship,—to consult together, to render judgment, and to reign together forever and ever.

ARTICLE VI.

STANDING IN ONE'S LOT AT THE END.*

By M. VALENTINE, D. D., President of Pennsylvania College, Gettysburg.

"Thou shalt stand in thy lot at the end of the days," Dan. 12 : 13.

It is because to stand in his lot at the end of the days one must choose and stand in it before the end, that we take these words as the starting point for some parting counsel at this time. There is a great law of cause and consequence for life. The beginning and the ending are bound together by natural tie. The close comes all the way from the opening. When the last link appears, it is locked back on the very first. There is a sure relation of dependence between the ultimate lot in every man's standing and the whole life at the close of which it is his own. What a man does, under both the law and grace of God, makes him what he becomes and conducts him to the goal he reaches. Daniel is found standing up in peaceful security, in the nobility of great manhood, under the arching sky of heaven's love, at the end of his days, because he had been standing up in fidelity to truth, duty and God from his early youth, always till here, by the great river Hiddekel, the angel speaks to him these supreme words of cheer and victory. The prophecy and pledge of this high conclusion are given us long before, when we see him, as a well-taught young man, conscientiously refusing to be defiled with even a king's meat and wines, in mature years carrying his integrity unsullied through high places of power, and in face of pagan edict still sending forth from open eastward window his morning prayers to the God of heaven. It hardly needs the angel's voice to tell us that such a life will sum up right and fulfil its great design.

This morning you are at the *beginning* of the days that are to show your quality and work out your portion. You have

*Baccalaureate Discourse, June 24, 1883.

ascended a point of outlook for a view that covers your life to its close. The prospect lies before you illuminated with the colored light which early vision casts upon the future. You feel the inspiration of the view. You have your plans, perhaps your ambitions. You wish to be useful. You hope for honor. You mean success and expect a happy life. But as you pause, this morning, on this margin of the coming years, we wish to speak to you of *the life that stands in its lot at the end*—pointing out, if possible, first, the great truth involved in a correct conception of life, and then the way in which it may exhibit that high consummation.

I. There is a great truth underlying all right conception of human life, of which we are here reminded in the simple use of the word "lot" in describing the happy completion of Daniel's career. In Jewish speech this stood for the great reality of a divine providence. Any man's true 'lot' was simply the divine design for him realized, God's plan accepted and accomplished. It means that to every one there is a real *allotment*, a right and worthy career provided for, and a way for its accomplishment. No one is put aimlessly in the midst of life. Man, as a race, has a special place in the rank of being and the ends of creation—a place to fill and fulfil. Each man has his own place, and stands for a thought of God, to be accomplished *in* him and *by* him. You are no accident, for accidental fate. And what you are meant to be is all that your nature and capacities make possible and fit you to become. The final standing place to which you are to count yourself personally allotted is just the useful, honorable, happy position that all your powers and opportunities under the guidance and help of divine love make attainable. In short, the intention for each of you is not only something, but the very best to which your nature has been correlated. To stand in your lot is to make *that* your own—to turn God's great sweet thought for you into reality, to be your right self and do your full work to the end, crowned there in your true nature and place.

We must carefully distinguish between the 'lot' which is the divine design for men and that which they often actually make theirs. Both reason and Scripture recognize the difference. In

our own consciousness we know ourselves to be free agents, and discover that by wrong choices and actions we lapse from the best possible. The Scriptures tell us the same thing. They speak, for instance, of God's will that all should be saved, and of men's dying, though he has no pleasure in such result—of men's refusal of life over against the divine will—of the loss of crowns that were potentially theirs. Disobedience refuses the divine plan of life, and sinks the line of advance down to lower endings. There is thus a failure—a defeat, to some degree, of life's great, open meaning. How far down below the right terminus a man may be at the end of the days, we may not now attempt to measure. It is enough to know—and the knowledge should thrill through every man's soul—that the false point may be apart from the true by an 'impassable gulf.' In such case the man has lost his own estate and has part, as the Bible puts it, with "satan and his angels." In a certain and lower sense even this result expresses a fact of God's allotment; for the law of consequence is his, and this appoints something lower to those who refuse the best and sell out their birthright. Even a Judas who goes to his place goes there under divinely fixed laws of cause and effect. For the penalties of moral as well as physical laws come naturally—that is, by regular order of consequence. The loving intent of these laws is the guidance of the obedient to their true possibilities and blessedness. But when they are broken through or disregarded, the wrong action and crime must work loss, degradation and misery. This is to stand in *another* lot whether at the beginning, middle or end of days.

This great truth—of life *under law*,—needs to be clearly fixed in your minds and strongly impressed on your souls. It is eminently a practical truth. For, that your life, to be lived aright, is to move according to a thought and plan of God, at once throws before your view, and keeps burning there, the great fact of responsibility—the truth of which Daniel Webster once said: '*It is the greatest idea I have ever had.*' A sense of the tremendous truth that God has mapped out the way for your life, and marked a high altitude for its work and goal, must on the one hand, give effective backing to conscience, and nerve

against all malign forces that would thwart the end. And, on the other hand, it is full of sweet, strengthening encouragement. For it assures you that God, and all the laws of his universe, are with your right endeavor, are *for* your right progress and success. It is a grand inspiration to see that the highest life and portion you can seek for yourself is just the very one God, as your almighty Maker and Saviour, desires for you and has arranged for your attainment.

This principle of an allotment reached under the action of fixed laws of cause and consequence, is one full of divine love. Men have often arraigned the constitution of the world, because of some severe consequences, when physical and moral forces, under unbending law go right on. But this uniformity of law is the opportunity in which your freedom can foresee, choose, and work out a successful life. Through this fixedness of linked consequence—seemingly so stern and merciless—you can look on down the years and the ages, and putting yourself in harmony with God and righteousness, ascend to the point and altitude rightfully yours—the possibilities God's love means for you. The reign of law in the world is the essential condition on which your reason and freedom can act successfully and come to their crown. Let me emphasize it—because our day is marked by most irrational revolt against law—that law is the basis of all the order, beauty, possible success and blessedness of life. It becomes misery only when men violate it, and refuse to stand in their lot and activity. They lose their place and work in God's order. That is misery. Then comes the smiting, the flame of woe, the outer darkness, the starless night. The severity of law is the love of God.

The special grace of the gospel is no contradiction to this. God is love, whether he acts in law or grace. We rightly glory in the divine pity that, to some extent, seems to arrest law to rescue and save. It was indeed love beyond all expression, that when man had lost his first estate, heaven interposed in special provision for some stay of consequences, for pardon and supernatural help. But this does not mean overthrow of law, but establishment of law, recovery from disobedience to righteousness and happiness. To be out of the life God's love intends for you

is death; and so this redeeming grace is but the supreme plan under which unison with eternal righteousness is found again, and you and I may stand anew in the character, activity and destiny of Love's primal design.

II. But our main business to-day, is to fix in your minds, if possible, *the essential conditions of standing in our lot*. The way must be understood. The thing meant is specific. It is not reached by chance.

I. The first thing we mention is a very plain point: You must have clear, true *vision of things*, a genuine discernment of the realities with which your life is concerned. You must have spiritual insight. The old fact never ceases to be a fact: "Having eyes they see not." This is men's sin; for to see is the true use of eyes. There are unquestionably many mysteries around and before men, impenetrable by their best powers. To know them may not be essential. But we may justly assume that what we have been organized to see, we *need* to see. To be blind is a crime. No small part of the weakness, blundering, waste and wreck of life comes from carrying about visionless eyes—the light that is within being made darkness. "How great is the darkness," is proved by sad facts everywhere. Many have utterly lost the path of life. Every community—might we not say every man,—exhibits wonderful feats of not seeing; and thousands are astray, or only groping and stumbling through life, instead of moving right on with firm ascending steps and the right and fitting deeds. There is light enough in the world, were men to open their souls to it. There are two chief relations in which the young especially at once need this clear discernment.

The *first* is in the way of *forecast*. Man is the only creature on earth, so far as we know, endowed with the capacity of foreseeing the future, reading natural and moral laws, and looking through them far into the coming years and the secrets of God's plan. Nature and life as observed become to him prophetic, and every man is made a prophet. A revelation has been added to lift the veil. The future has become visible in the present. This capacity to read the coming years is a wonderful endowment of humanity—a thing in which man is made in the image

of God. It is meant to enable him to put himself in right relation to his destiny and work it out.

The present must act for the future. Have you ever thought how grand and sovereign is this law for everything good? While man is the only creature that consciously plans and pursues aims, even the lowest ranks are found really acting for the future, though they know it not. So necessary is this that, as they cannot consciously see the future, they are somehow guided as if they did by instinct or by the very laws of their organization. There is a seeing Eye back of them, that has done the conscious seeing and has set their movement to the end. So the bee constructs its cell, and the bird builds its nest or migrates to more congenial climes. So the forces of growth construct the eye in the darkness for the future light, and the tree and flowers prepare the seed for the growth of another year. The whole realm of unconscious nature is made to act for the future as if it had penetrated it with piercing, far-reaching vision, a vision setting it all to work with thrilled heart and busy hands. The great law that what is to come rules, as a final cause, that which precedes, is legible everywhere, and may be traced all the way up the mighty geological movement, preparing for the coming, work and intended mission of man. But it seems to be man only, who alone has been endowed with the power of consciously looking, along with God, into the future, that rebels against the order of the law. He uses his free power as a freedom not to do it. For short-sightedness he often takes the prize. When he does look ahead, it is often at far other than his main duties and interests. It is one of the noblest and divinest functions to which your nature has been adapted, to sweep your entire hereafter with the clear ray of an earnest and appreciating forecast. When a young man at the very beginning grasps the point at which his life is to come to its fulness, he has gotten for his life what the port is to the helmsman on the sea or the architect's draft is for the towering, glory-crowned temple. It determines all. It is guidance, strength, success. As to *character*, a man already is what his aspiration and purpose embody. As to what he will do, it is the vision chosen that lifts every step to it. The young man

who lifts not his eyes to his utmost future, who lives only by the day, with whom it is enough to act at passing inclination, and have a good time, will not *be* much or come to much. Though he is a vessel built to enter a far distant port, the fires never kindle nor the breezes stretch the canvas toward it. Pierce your future, young men, with the beam of earnest forecast. Look where you are to come out in the end of days, and get helmage for yourself.

The other part of the needed vision is of the *moral and spiritual realities that belong to the passing day*. Not only is there a great future, but a greater present than most men see. It has realities dimly discerned at best, and utterly overlooked by many—realities touching us every day and hour, golden threads guiding up the heights, or forces on which we may break and go to pieces. An apostle speaks of the need as a 'looking at things unseen,' invisible to mere sense. Humanity is organic, and you live much in relations. These relations form the moral or spiritual sphere, in which man finds his most solemn probation and the possibilities of his highest blessedness. You live in a world filled, not only with God's omnipresence, but with the spiritual laws which are the modes of His will for the welfare of all. There are such realities as truth, righteousness, purity, love, goodness, and character. In brief, we are *moral* beings, and have place in a moral world, in a cosmic constitution, whose highest organization is for character, both of others and self, and the blessedness which Heaven has joined with it. In this we come to the high rank and diadem of our nature, the summit at which it reaches its perfection, glory and joy. These great spiritual forces of the world—laws of welfare, duty, excellence and usefulness, laws which clasp our daily life closer than the air—are the most momentous realities with which we have to do. We need hardly say to you that a man without controlling vision of these things, is void of the great function allotted to his nature, has already dropped out of place and dignity, and must move on a low plane to lower. There are many men of this sort these days—with life in simply sensuous or sensual grade. This is a materialistic age—as the phrase goes. Some men consider man as only dirt. That is theoretical ma-

terialism. It leads to a practical materialism, which surrenders this supposed dirt to dirt—not simply “dust to dust” for the body when it dies, but the whole man while he lives. There is a fever and rush for wealth, place, show, sumptuous living. The life is for meat and the body for raiment. The marvelous achievements of science, discovery and invention have added such rich gains to the material comforts and attractions of life, as to entrance the vision and obscure it to everything else. The pomp and glitter and glare of full material conditions fill the whole sky of thought to thousands, with corresponding damage, alas, to their perception and estimate of moral and spiritual verities and obligations. Material enterprise and success count for everything — weigh down against everything. Character is pushed into a corner for them. An English writer says: “We Englishmen are a people of small niggling minds. We it is who invent potato-parers, lemon-squeezers, patent axles, and new coal-scuttles, and so appreciate them that any man who can claim one such thing may make a fortune out of it. But if it be merely a great idea that he has conceived, or a great principle that he would enforce, he had best hold his tongue, unless he is prepared to take to himself, and enjoy as his reward, cursing, reviling, contempt and poverty.” This language brings out a fact, though it falsely exaggerates it. With multitudes, here as in England, nothing is worth anything unless it is bankable, or has material utility. They count “progress” solely by these things, and euphemize the gross materialism by the term “practical” which is the supreme talismanic word for this generation. Some find in them their most decisive measure of man; and when it is found that the earth has had, first, a “stone age,” then an “iron age,” and has now come to an omni-metallic age, we are asked to see in it not the advance of the race in a particular use of its faculties, but evidence of progressive acquisition of faculties in the human constitution; as if forsooth, actual skill in making pottery, hatchets, coins, guns, powder, steam-engines, telegraphs, telephones and dynamite, and using them, were synonymous with manhood and its supreme mission. We rightly rejoice in these material advances of the race. They do betoken some of its climbing, ascendant capac-

ity. He would be an idiot who would deny the excellence of the scientific and nature-conquering faculty in man. It is part of his sublime equipment for the high mission given him in the world. Science is to be praised for all these gifts—except dynamite. He would indeed be a fool who should prize them but slightly or vilify the “practical progress” that gives richness to civilization. But so, too, is he who makes life to consist in them, buries his higher nature in them, allows them to put out instead of clarifying his spiritual eyes. The hardest thing under the sun for men to learn and consistently act out, is that which the Great Teacher uttered for the race eighteen centuries ago: “A man’s life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth.” Valuable as they are as means, they carnalize and degrade the life if looked on as the end. The kindredship of your nature is in a higher realm, with things diviner and more enduring. The spiritual health of your nature is better than money. A loving soul is greater than stocks. Purity is something finer than gorgeous apparel. Character is diviner than a full house and luxurious table. Manhood is more than all it can use, and in using uses up.

It is not to be said that this age has wholly gone after material good, and that there is no high thinking, no devotion to great ideas and principles. The world has never seen grander thought than our times present, loftier fidelity to truth, righteousness and love. The sovereignty of ideas has never been more marked. Moral principles, as well as Christian vision, are nearing the zenith of power. Both the good and the bad of our day are intense—are colossal and counter forces. And it is just in the presence of this opening of all the seals of moral and spiritual light, when the grandeur of human virtue over against everything else is easily known, that life without this vision becomes at once shamefully inexcusable and surely fatal.

There can be no question that the young need to be specially reminded of this danger. No one can now safely go forth to life’s critical task without a clairvoyant moral faculty. For the lack appears not only among the uneducated, the ignorant, or socially degraded classes. You will find everywhere men of

talent and prominence, with hardly a sign of moral consciousness. They "can discern the face of the sky," financially, politically, commercially, professionally, but of moral principles and interests they seem never to catch sight. Too much sight of sense has smitten them with moral blindness. Nor is it in conspicuous offenders alone that vision of moral distinctions has become too dim and feeble—as when the faro-thief sweeps hundreds into his pocket by turn of card, or a Gould, king of stock-gambling, a hundred thousand by forced scalings, or when a Sullivan, prince of bruisers, arranges the brutalities of the ring. But the lack is dropping down life in all callings—as when the merchant uses unfairness for profit, or the lawyer employs wrong for success, or the occupant of the pulpit puts selfish advantage above the ends of his holy calling. Facts everywhere observable—the business some adopt, the way others do business, the way they fulfil engagements or refuse to fulfil, the way men use their tongues or fail to use them, and numberless other things,—give appalling proof that the things which are spiritually discerned are only faintly, or not at all, discerned by many and inadequately even by the best. The rot thus allowed continued action in character is not small. Our age needs a clearer vision and intenser sense of spiritual verities. What are we to think when one of the foremost scientists of the age, having gazed with a phenomenal enthusiasm and industry into the facts of the physical realm, confesses, in substance, at the close of his life that he has not taken the time or trouble to settle for his own heart the question of his own immortality, and the meaning and demands of the wonderful phenomenon of Christianity in the world. This may be the wisdom of the world, but it is not the wisdom from above. My young friends, you need a larger horizon than the horizon of sense, though that should be cleared and enlarged to the full sweep of science. You cannot rightfully live this life unless you have a horizon larger than this life. You can neither find your right lot, nor are fit to start forward for the responsibilities, work and *outcome* of life, until you view all of it in the light of the cross, and its spiritual demands. And your education has done but little for you, falling far short of the need, if with all your mental discipline, you

have not developed the spiritual eye that looks straight through the glamour and mirage of this world to the things that are eternally real and belong to your true lot forever.

2. Another necessity is a *vigorous selfhood for resistance* of evil. Daniel, from whose success we are drawing instruction, was distinguished by remarkable self-control. There was no weak pliability about him. He had a strong personality, and nobody could handle it but himself. Under God, he owned himself thoroughly. So must every man who wishes to hold his lot.

The world is full of men who fail to possess themselves aright, and will want to use you. They are the very sort that will try to do this. There are omnipresent influences in the world that, if not withstood, will uncrown and unman you. To such influences Samson, with all his locks, was weak. He could kill foxes, smite lions or carry off gate-posts, but a selfhood for moral resistance was wanting. Nothing will supply the place of this—for safe standing. Brilliant intellect will not—stores of knowledge will not—social position will not—high office will not. Under the grace of God your nature must be thoroughly unified and so set on rock of principles as to become self-asserting over against temptation. Clear vision, as already pointed out, has much to do with this. A true conscience is an element in it, and a will that has nerve. The victories of God's defending grace in a man come through putting firmness into an enlightened and sanctified will. Indeed, until God can get a man to assert a strong holy will-power, there is no saving him in such a life as you have to battle through. He will not stand in his lot, though put into it a thousand times. Sometimes young men illustrate this trouble before they leave college. Helped up from moral lapses again and again, they are continually down by fresh waves of temptation, falls and repentances following with weakening effect on the moral constitution, till at last all hopes of their being able to stand in their lot cease. The young man who enters the rough world with no more selfhood of resistance has small chance. The doctrine of the survival of the fittest suggests what must become of him.

I have great respect for the little coral polyp. It is very

small, a mere speck, and has its lot in the rough seas where the waves are incessant, fierce, and strong. But against these waves, so mighty that they erode firmest rocks, each little coral polyp maintains its place, and by asserting its allotment wins even from the raging waters of the Gulf Stream leagues of land for man—mangrove forests and orange farms. There is something grand in that strength, on which the floods beat in vain. More of this invincible resistance is needed in the nerve of intelligent man for his place. It must be able to say no to the influences that endanger, with the grand emphasis of the little polyp to the Gulf Stream.

3. A further need is *energetic nerve for action and progress*. Here again the example of Daniel is in place. From the day of his captive entrance into Babylon, on through all his premiership of the empire, he rose and stood by his ready and fine capacity for work. His broad and discriminating vision of realities unnoticed by others, and his thorough self-possession, naturally *led* him to be a man of action—sublime activity. Hence when his life was 'measured,' it was not found wanting. There is no such thing as a young man's getting into or keeping his divine lot in idleness or nervelessness. For, the very life allotted to him is one of work, of rich usefulness, a mission of service to be nobly done. If he is not doing it every day, his to-morrows will show no progress, and the end will exhibit failure. Here is the fatal defect in scores of the young. Society is crowded, every profession and calling is packed, with the inefficiency of indolence.

The energetic nerve, of which we speak, is not simply for effort which is considered spiritual, but for all proper secular good as well. For, you must not get befogged in the distinction between things secular and spiritual. To the Christian mind that has open vision, *all* things, from greatest to smallest, are seen to come under moral and spiritual relations and the great principle of duty. It is as truly your duty to work for your daily bread as to pray and worship. You have *one* life—a unit. When it fulfills secular labor in the spirit of love to God, under the sanction of conscience, it is all upraised into moral character, the commonest things becoming sacred and

holy. George Herbert was right when he wrote :

"Who sweeps a room as by God's laws
Makes it and the action fine."

It is a spurious spirituality that neglects practical secularities. You are to lift them all into the unity and symmetry of a consistent activity. It is one of the grand fruits of the grace of Christ, that in it you are living to God both in laboring for the life that now is and that which is to come. The hope of heaven in the future means a larger, richer earth at present. That you see far-off relations and interests, only intensifies the claims of the hour right before you. Though the pole-star of the mariner is in the sky, he finds his duties right down on the ship.

We must understand clearly the law that holds here. A man comes to his lot by work as well as by faith. Down to the purest secularities, work is not only duty done, but position gained. Longfellow, in his *Golden Legend* says of a great cathedral : "The architect built his great heart into these sculptured stones, and with him toiled his children, and their lives were builded with his own into the walls, as offerings unto God." There is something almost pathetic in this leaving, as every man does, his personality, his thought, his heart, in his work, to be communed with by others in after times ; but there is something almost fearful in the record and building of that work in his own life. There is a unique connection, as sure as a man's being, under which his building without builds also within. By the law of habit, under which he is moulded by what he does, the way a man is to rise to his right self and place, is by doing his true work—with mind, heart, and hands. Every day's work, while it is so much achieved, carries the man himself forward to the right action and excellence of his nature. This results from the great fact that he is a free, moral being, with an organization of powers submitted to self-training for their true activity and sphere. He is made subject to the peculiar law of action and consequence which we call habit. A stone thrown into the air gains no habit of staying there. But a man's action forms a tendency to act and moulds him into character. He takes on his own activities. He grows into the colors he paints with.

Knowing the effect of his work, he is enabled to make himself what he is intended to become, and reach his lot. A gem, a crystal has no hand in determining its own form, whether three-sided, six or eight-sided, or its place, as left in the dust or set in a crown. But it is ordained that every man takes hold of himself by his activities, and he builds his work, good or bad, up in himself forever. From the activities that exercise and develop mind and heart these earthly years he must carry character far on in the great hereafter. It is so, not indeed by the simple physical manipulation, and not much by special callings or professions alone, but by the spirit in which the work is done, and the moral forces one gives play and permanent sovereignty in his nature. A conspicuous illustration how work nobly done may help to crown a man even here is seen in the late Wm. E. Dodge. With spiritual vision both broad and clear, and strong self-ownership, he was a man of immense and tireless work, under stress of perpetual effort, in a complexity of labors not less than Daniel wrestled with in the affairs of the empire. But because it was pervaded by the spirit of piety, because it continually enthroned principle, because every day's activity was the play and development of righteousness, truth, purity, love and unselfishness, it raised him up so that at the end he stood before the whole land as one of the most complete and full-orbed men of this 19th century. This is a conspicuous case, I admit. But every community, every profession and calling exhibits the difference between good men that have energy and those who have none, between those who take a lot by work and those who take one in shirking it.

This needed energy is effective mainly by a wakeful seizure of opportunities. Open vision will see these; a ready spirit will utilize them. The question of success hinges right here. Life's opportunities are its capital, and they come as incidental chances—in fragments of time that may be saved from idleness or redeemed from trifling, occasions for good little deeds that open to larger, or small activities that only keep the tension of nerve ready for greater. A grand result is gained not from some splendid occasion, but as the sum of all the little chances of daily life. These grow and widen and lift till he who began

low is set on high. Success is mostly in a sharp eye and an earnest soul. Some young men neither make nor use these chances—others are always equal to them and grow equal to more. The priest and the Levite that went down from Jerusalem to Jericho had the same chance with the Samaritan, but failed. The Samaritan stood in his lot, and rose higher. The others passed by and went on down. The other side from a good deed is always going down. Thousands of young men in New York had as much chance as Peter Cooper. But what a superior possibility it became to his ready will and manly energy. Poor, uneducated, apprenticed at 17 to coach-making, his sky did not seem bright or large. But right in the midst of this straitness the germinal force of energy appeared. This showed itself in steadily resisting the nightly attractions and seductive influences of the city, and utilizing the evening hours for reading, experiment, and supplying the deficiency of his early education. The critical hours between sunset and slumber, which are blank or wreck to so many, he turned into knowledge, self-culture and manly power. Perhaps he had read of Franklin, the printer, in this way becoming the philosopher and statesman, of Linnæus, the shoemaker, becoming the world's botanist, or of Hugh Miller, the stone-mason, becoming the geologist who disclosed to men the footsteps of the Creator in the rocks. At any rate, grasping the "chance" of hours when other young men were in saloon or theater or asleep, Peter Cooper studied, invented, worked and rose. Wealth came, but no sordidness; for by doing good with it, he cultivated love to God and men. Too noble to love money and too simple-hearted to care for splendid living, still enlarging wealth only enlarged his philanthropy and generous activity. His benefactions continued princely; and when, under this training of useful activity, he reached the close of his lengthened days, he was in the eye of the millions of this land as a grand illustration of the possibilities which self-regulating industry may work out of humble conditions. But the genius by which he stood in the lot of his success was, most of all, the energy that used opportunities which others throw away. This is usually so.

"The heights by great men gained and kept
Were not attained by sudden flight,
But they, while their companions slept,
Were toiling upward in the night."

The different results with two young men from the same family, from the same community, the same class is mainly the answer to this "*toiling* upward" by one while the other takes it easy. It begins in college; it is apt to go on after college.

Of course this energy must be persevering. A good start must come to its goal by an unflagging continuance. The morning hour is a great thing, but there is trial in the "burden and heat of the day." Men may fail in the wilderness after an enthusiastic start towards Canaan. Many a life of early promise breaks and goes to pieces by lack of endurance of nerve. The old motto about perseverance conquering is not too old for adoption by every young man that enters the world and means to leave it at his true level.

4. We cannot but include, for a true standing in lot at the end of days, a maintenance of the right *bodily* vigor. You hardly fulfill the divine plan if you defraud your soul of a healthy body, wrecking it before your work is done, or turning the close into disabling feebleness. There is something fine in soul and body working well and with unabated force to the end. It is your duty, if possible, to have it so. We know, indeed, that bodily strength is something not wholly at our command. But in part it is. We are not ready to say, as has been said, that it is a sin to be sick. But truth compels to say that much of men's sickness is sin. The violations of God's plain laws of health these days are very grievous. By unregulated eating and drinking, by unnatural habits that send stupor or trembling through all the nerves, many allow their souls only an inferior or abused body for their work at best. The pure offices of the lower nature for the higher are made impossible. Often, as a shattered, stranded hulk, the body goes to pieces long before the time. The youthful Daniel's rounded and attractive health, by abstinence and simple diet of pulse, tells of his starting, at least, to keep a sound body for a pure soul. "Let not sin reign in your mortal body." It is part of the completest and happy

stand—in your lot at the end of the days to be there in a body well-used, but clean and unabused. For even your body is for Christ and the resurrection.

Young gentlemen of the class of '83, you have come to the time from which your college days will be a memory. We wish them to be much more—forever more. Your education has been meant to set you forth in life aright, prepared to achieve it well. It has been directed with the aim to open and clarify your vision of the full moral constitution of the world, and all the great laws of your being, for both physical and spiritual welfare. It has sought to start you in the self-control and work which your own energy must carry to success. The institution desires that your college-days, a happy memory indeed, may also be a beneficent influence and an elevating force to the end. It is for you, now, to make the possible real and accumulate the advantages of the past into a still richer life in the future. Your course, if true, can neither be downward nor on a level, but climbing, still climbing till the sun of your life disappears to shine in other spheres.

Key your aims high—to the very best possible. But do not mistake what is the highest and best. It is not to get rich, to live in splendid luxury, or stand in conspicuous position. It is no attainment of selfishness of any kind. The divine law of highest is: He is greatest who serves best both God and men—who lives the noblest, most Christ-like life. You are not therefore, after all, to think so much about what you are going to make of yourself, or what eminences you are going to reach, as simply to live your right life and do your true work day by day. This, under God's grace, will make you what you are to be, and bring you where you ought to stand. Do not, therefore, be afraid of work or self-denial. The earth has nothing good for men that comes not by struggle, sweat and sacrifice. The upward movement of life comes only to brave hearts and strained nerves. Accept hardship, if need be. Seek no soft-handed ease. You cannot now unveil the future and foresee what shall be the circumstances or emergencies with which you will have to deal. Providence may throw upon you important

and conspicuous service. You may need to tax all your resources to stand in your lot with success. But however large it may be, giving it the consecration of a truly Christian manhood, God will diadem you in it and by it. But you may find your place, as most do, in humble position, straitened, embarrassed with disadvantages, weighted down with cares. It is comparatively easy to work hard and keep your own in prominent place, cheered by prosperity, cheered on possibly by sounding applause. But to work on in humble place, to hold your energy in high tension in obscurity, to go on doing necessary small service in the silence of an atmosphere never waked by praise—this is the hard thing. But this is the grand thing. For it is these small things, done by the humble many, in humble relations and humble ways, that fill life with its best richness and sweetness. You may come to your diadem in these *lowly* services—a diadem as richly set as the richest. And though these humbler activities may have no loud report, they may bless with farther-reaching joy than proud ones could. A little act may enclose great virtue, and the smallest good deed may grow, fructifying and coming at last into results that fill wide spaces with joy,

"Even as a great tree grows from two small leaves,
To spread its shade afar."

Especially be *Christians*—Christians indeed, giving the world the benefit and yourselves the happiness of a life thoroughly animated and ruled by grace. Let your piety be earnest—no pale suggestion of Christianity, but its solid, strong, living self. Then, however far apart you may be scattered, as you go forth from your educational home, through whatever scenes you may find your onward way, in whatever callings you may labor, whatever trials you may suffer, you will let every step be coming more and more into what God's love has provided for you; and at the very end of the days you will have not only the joy of standing in your lot, but the more Christ-like joy of having helped others to stand in theirs.

ARTICLE VII.

THE CALL TO THE MINISTRY.

THE PREVALENT AND TRUE THEORIES EXAMINED.

By F. W. CONRAD, D. D., Philadelphia, Pa.

Jesus Christ represented the world under the similitude of a great field, in which a spiritual harvest is growing, wide in extent, priceless in value, ripe for the sickle, and ready to perish. The ability and willingness of the Lord of the harvest to send laborers into this harvest, and the duty of the Church to pray to him to call an adequate number to gather it, as well as to make the necessary efforts to induce those thus called to devote their lives to it, are both declared and enjoined in the word of God. Notwithstanding this, the disproportion between the number of the laborers and the extent of the harvest has continued for ages, and the moral results have proven most disastrous to mankind. Because the laborers were too few, much of the harvest of the world-field perished during the past; because their number is still inadequate, vast proportions of it are perishing now; and if no remedy has been devised and can be applied, the full harvest can never be gathered into the garner of heaven.

The questions accordingly arise: Must the laborers always be too few, and much of the harvest continue to perish? Has the Lord of the harvest been unwilling to call an adequate number of laborers, or has the Church entertained erroneous views concerning the call to the ministry, and failed to make the necessary efforts to induce those called to enter her service? To us it is manifest that the latter, and not the former, is the true cause of the inadequacy of the number of ministers to preach the Gospel according to the great commission of Christ to every creature. This we hope to establish by an examination of the prevalent and true theories concerning the call to the ministry.

THE PREVALENT THEORY STATED AND FOUND WANTING.

A theory embraces certain ideas, which operate as governing principles in practice. The ideas generally entertained concerning the call to the ministry, consequently, constitute the theory

and influence the practice of the Church. According to the prevalent theory it is held that a call to the ministry emanates directly from God; that it is addressed to particular individuals; that the conviction of their call is impressed upon their minds in an extraordinary manner, through the immediate influence of the Holy Spirit; that these will be introduced into the ministry by the grace and providence of God; that those called are either in the ministry or else in a course of preparation for it; that few if any who have devoted themselves to other vocations and professions, were called to the ministry; that the number thus called is entirely inadequate to preach the unsearchable riches of Christ to the poor and famishing millions of the world; and that, however much the Church may regret this deficiency and mourn over the consequent ruin of souls, she is neither responsible for, nor able to remedy it.

As theory determines the practice of the Church, so, too, does her practice reveal her theory. Holding the views concerning the call to the ministry just expressed, and impressed by the danger of introducing uncalled men into the sacred office, she has not felt the weight of responsibility resting upon her; and deeming it best to withhold her hand from the subject, she has, to a great extent left the supply of ministers to the judgment of individuals, influenced by their own impulses and convictions of duty, believed to have been produced by the internal working of the Spirit, and corroborated by the external leadings of the providence of God. That this theory is erroneous, we trust will be demonstrated by a due consideration of the following arguments.

1. Because it is unreasonable. It is unreasonable to expect the attainment of an end without making ample provision of the means adapted to attain it. A husbandman who has a thousand acres of wheat to harvest, cannot reasonably expect to gather it if he be unwilling to employ the number of men indispensably necessary to accomplish it. The moral harvest ripening in the world-field will not gather itself; it cannot be gathered without an adequate number of laborers; and, hence, if the Lord of the harvest has failed to call them, as the theory we are combating presupposes, he cannot expect that it shall be gath-

ered. But the Lord of the harvest does expect that it shall be gathered, imposes the obligation upon the Church to do all that is necessary to save it, and reveals the period when it will have been accomplished. But if the theory under consideration were true, that an inadequate number of men are called into the ministry, then the duty imposed upon the Church to preach the Gospel to every creature, cannot be performed, and, humanly speaking, the kingdoms of this world can never become the kingdoms of the Lord and his Christ.

2. Because it is inconsistent with the adequacy of all the other provisions of redemption. Man is guilty, and needs pardon. Provision is made to secure it through the atonement of Christ, who, by tasting death for every man, became the propitiation for the sins of the whole world. Man is depraved, and needs the sanctification of his nature. Redemption makes provision for this, through the transforming power of the Holy Spirit, whom God has poured out upon all flesh, and promised to give to every one that asketh him. To reveal to man the atonement, and to regenerate his heart, the Gospel is indispensable; and God has commanded his ministers to preach it to every creature, and given the assurance that it would prove the wisdom and power of God unto salvation. But as the Christian ministry constitutes an essential part of the provisions of redemption, and as all the provisions just mentioned are characterized by universality, that pertaining to the ministry must correspond with them in this respect, involving the call of an adequate number of ministers to proclaim the Gospel to all nations.

3. Because it limits all the provisions of redemption by the measure of the inadequate part. The strength of a chain, capable of raising a thousand pounds, is limited by a single link adequate to bear only a hundred pounds. An adequate supply of medicinal remedies is limited, in its saving efficacy, by the number of physicians engaged in applying it to the diseased. In like manner, will the adequacy of all the essential provisions of redemption be limited by the degree of inadequacy attaching to the deficient part. Just in proportion, therefore, as the number of those called to the ministry is reduced, and rendered inadequate to make Christ and his salvation known to all men, in

that proportion are all the associated provisions of redemption, the atonement, the influence of the Spirit, and quickening power of the Gospel, limited in their saving efficacy. But as such a deficiency in the number of the ministers called, and the consequent limitation of the provisions of redemption, involves the perfection of the plan of salvation, the consistency of its parts, as well as the wisdom and mercy of God, it cannot possibly be true.

4. Because it throws the responsibility of the inadequacy of the number of the ministry and consequent loss of the harvest upon the Lord of glory. The value of a single soul transcends all human calculation. Its ruin constitutes the greatest calamity of the moral universe—its salvation, the greatest achievement of redemption. An adequate number of ministers is indispensable to save the moral harvest; and if the Lord of the harvest be unwilling to call them to the work of gathering it, and in consequence thereof any portion of it perish, it is impossible to discern how the responsibility of such loss can be removed from him. But as his perfection forbids such a supposition and as he himself challenges the universe to lay the responsibility of the loss of mankind upon him, by the interrogatory: "What could I have done unto my vineyard, that I have not done unto it?" the theory that involves it must be false.

5. Because it is unscriptural. An induction, in order to establish its truthfulness, must include all the facts pertaining to it; and just in proportion as the number of facts increases that cannot be interpreted by it, will the probabilities be strengthened that it is not founded upon a scientific basis. An hypothesis that can produce no facts to sustain it, is utterly false. And the same tests must be called into requisition in determining religious questions. Let us apply them to the theory under consideration. Not a single example can be cited from the Scriptures where a person presented himself, either to the apostles, or to a congregation, as one called by the Lord of the harvest, as a laborer (minister), on the ground that he possessed the natural and spiritual qualifications fitting him for the work, and that he had been brought to this conclusion by an internal call

from the Holy Spirit. Nor can a case be adduced where such an applicant was accredited by the apostles, and accepted or chosen by any Christian congregation. The case of Isaiah (vi. 8), who, in answer to the questions put to him by the Lord of glory, "Whom shall we send?—and who will go for us?" said: "Here am I, send me," is ruled out by the fact that he was not on this wise called to the prophetic office, but to some special work as an accredited messenger of God; and the declaration of the Son to the Father, "Lo I come, in the volume of the Book it is written of me, to do thy will, O God!" cannot be legitimately appropriated in bolstering up such pretensions. Although the head and exemplar of the ministry, and although conscious, even from his childhood, that he was called by the Father to be the Prophet of God, like unto Moses, and the Minister of the New Covenant, yet did he not assume this office until he was designated as such by the baptism of John, the visible descent of the Holy Spirit, and the audible voice of God, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." A theory left unsupported by a single relevant example must be purely hypothetical, and prove both delusive and inadequate to supply the Church with a sufficient number of well qualified and duly called and accredited ministers of Christ.

6. Because the scripture passages and precedents appealed to to sustain it are misunderstood and misinterpreted. Moses and the prophets were directly called by God, and the apostles and evangelists by Christ in a similar manner. They were inspired by the Holy Ghost, endowed with the gift of tongues, and invested with miraculous powers, as attestations of their divine appointment. But the immediate call of prophets ceased with Malachi, and that of apostles, with Paul, and ministers are now called into the sacred office, mediately through the Church. The extraordinary influences of the Holy Spirit, involving direct inspiration, and the power to perform miracles, have also ceased, and all revelations of the divine will, and all communications of religious truth, are now made through the written word, and the ordinary influences of the Holy Spirit, involving a conviction of a call to the ministry, a knowledge of having passed from death unto life, and spiritual assistance in the exer-

cise of prayer and preaching the Gospel. The Anabaptists and other enthusiasts that arose in the Reformation, perverted the passages and precedents of Scripture, referring to the immediate call of prophets and apostles, and their inspiration, and claimed that they were called to the ministry in the same manner, and endowed with the extraordinary influences of the Holy Spirit, superceding the necessity of education; premeditation and study, in prayer and preaching. The following quotations from Luther and Melanchthon, exhibit the fanatical pretensions of these "heavenly prophets" as they were styled in derision.

Melanchthon on the Zwickau fanatics to the elector of Saxony: "I have heard them. It is wonderful what they proclaim concerning themselves, viz, that they have been sent to teach by the clear voice of God, that they have had familiar conversations with God, that they see future things; briefly, that they are prophetic and apostolic men. How I am moved by this, I cannot easily say. For important reasons, I am inclined not to despise them; for that some spiritual beings [*quosdam spiritus*] are in them, is apparent by many proofs, but no one can readily judge thereof except Martin." Concerning this matter Luther writes to Melanchthon: "I do not approve of your timidity, since you excel me both in spirit and learning. In the first place, when they give testimony concerning themselves they are not to be at once heard, but, according to the advice of St. John, the spirits are to be proved. You have, too, the advice of Gamaliel to differ; for so far nothing has been said or done by them which I have heard, that Satan cannot do or imitate. Do you then for me, try if they can prove their call. For God never has sent any one, unless called by man, or with his call attested by signs—not even his own Son. Formerly the prophets derived their authority from the prophetic law and order, just as we now through men. I am entirely opposed to their reception, if they proclaim that they have been called by a revelation alone, since God was unwilling to call Samuel except with the authority of Eli attesting it. So far as to the public function of teaching.

Test also their private spirit. Examine whether they have experienced those spiritual sorrows, and divine pains of birth,

deaths and hells. If you hear them proclaiming bland, mild, devout and pious things, even though they say they have been carried up to the third heaven, do not approve them. For the sign of the Son of Man is wanting, which is the only test of Christians, and the sure discerner of spirits. Would you know the place, time and mode of divine conversations? Try them, and do not listen even to Jesus when he boasts, unless you first see him crucified."

Concerning a conference between Luther and Melanchthon, Mark Stübner and Cellarius at Wittenberg, Camerarius says:

"Luther very calmly heard Mark narrating his claims. When he had ended, Luther thinking there should be no discussion against such absurd and futile pretensions, gave them this advice: They should consider what they were doing. That none of the things that they mentioned were supported by Holy Scripture, and that they were either the invention of curious thoughts, or the insane and pernicious representations of a lying and deceitful spirit. Cellarius, with frantic voice and gestures, stamping the floor with his feet, and striking the table with his hands, exclaimed that it was an outrage for Luther to presume to have any such suspicions concerning a divine man. But Mark said more calmly: 'That you may know, Luther, that I am furnished with the Spirit of God, I will tell you what you are thinking about. It is this: You are beginning to be inclined to believe that my doctrine is true.' Whereupon Luther replied: 'May the Lord rebuke thee, O Satan.' After this, Luther thought he should have no more words with them, and dismissed them.*

The early Puritans and Quakers fell into similar errors, and set up similar pretensions, in regard to the immediate call and direct revelations from the Spirit.

In corroboration of this we present the following quotations: Alt in his "*Geschichte des Christlichen Cultus*" speaks thus of the views of the English Puritans: "As a rule, there was always one in each congregation, who generally filled the office of principal speaker, nevertheless he was not the preacher appointed

*Seckendorf, I., pp. 192, 193.

by the congregation, but only that member of the same on whom, above others the gift of teaching had been bestowed. And when the Spirit seemed to have departed from him, they, without any hesitation, elected another in his place. For the prevailing of the Gospel was not to be a matter of office and calling, but a work of the Holy Spirit, and the preacher became, in the Old Testament sense of the word, a prophet."

Barclay in his Apology sets forth the theory of the Quakers: "As by the light or gift of God, all true knowledge in things spiritual is received and revealed, so by the same, as it is manifested and received in the heart, by the strength and power thereof, every true minister of the Gospel is ordained, prepared and supplied in the work of the ministry. * * Moreover, they who have this authority may and ought to preach the Gospel, *though without human commission* or literature." Further, Barclay says that this light or gift of God is of such a nature "that these divine revelations are not to be subjected to the test, either of the outward testimony of the Scriptures or the natural reason of man, as to a more noble or certain rule or touchstone; for this divine revelation and inward illumination is that which is evident and clear of itself."*

Although most of those who hold the prevalent theory of a call to the ministry discard the extremes into which the Anabaptists, the English Puritans and the Quakers were led, nevertheless, in so far as they deny that the conviction of a call to the ministry is called forth according to the laws of the human mind, as affected by the truths revealed in the Scriptures, under the ordinary influence of the Holy Spirit, and maintain that it originates in some impulse, impression, or intimation wrought by the direct influence of the Holy Spirit, they occupy substantially the same ground on which all the other extravagant pretensions of the enthusiasts and mystics are predicated.

THE TRUE THEORY STATED.

The constitutional endowments, spiritual gifts, and voluntary exercises, that enter into the constitution of a call to the ministry are the following: Such natural talents as would, if properly

*Schwenkfeldt, Böhme, and most of the mystics entertained similar views.

cultivated, qualify the individual for the successful prosecution of the work of the ministry. Such measures of saving faith and divine grace as would render him a "workman that needeth not to be ashamed" in the kingdom of God. Such views of the true object of life, namely, to glorify God by doing good, as to induce him to devote himself to its attainment. Such a conviction that in the ministry he could do the most good to his fellow men, and glorify God in the highest degree, as would bind the conscience, and impose the obligation to choose it as a profession, and induce the formation of a governing purpose to prepare for and enter it. Such a knowledge of the work of the ministry itself, and of the character and service of the church in which he expects to prosecute it, as will render it both interesting and attractive to him, and impel him to persevere in the prosecution of his course of preparation unto the end, notwithstanding the honors and emoluments held out to him by the world, and in spite of any providential obstacles that might stand in his way.

This call is not miraculous but rational, not extraordinary but ordinary, not immediate but mediate. It is not communicated in an arbitrary, but in a natural manner. The conviction of its existence is not found in any notion or impulse, impression or desire, that may have at a certain time originated, been felt, or repeated in some peculiar manner, nor by any special indications of Providence, but brought about according to the natural laws governing the exercises of the mind. Neither is it called forth by any special revelation of some particular truth, nor by any inward voice or immediate assurance given by the Holy Ghost, but through the instructions contained in the Sacred Scriptures, apprehended and received through the ordinary influences of the Spirit of God.

The natural talents and spiritual graces, as constituent elements of the ministerial vocation, are all capable of development. In order that the conviction of a call to the ministry may arise in consciousness, they must be brought into voluntary and consistent exercise—in other words, rationally and spiritually cultivated. They cannot develop themselves. If not brought under the influence of their appropriate means, they

will remain dormant. If neglected, and left to develop themselves spontaneously, without mental culture and religious training, the result would be abnormal, irrational, and fanatical. Their cultivation cannot, therefore, be safely left to chance, caprice or hap-hazard, but must be accomplished by intelligent and persevering effort. Take natural talents—how can these be cultivated without schools, colleges and seminaries? True piety—how can this be attained without the diligent use of the means of grace? The true object of life—how can correct views concerning it be imparted without special instruction? The conviction that in the ministry highest usefulness could be attained and God glorified—how can that be called forth, without an adequate knowledge of its nature, requirements, adaptations and usefulness? The attractiveness of the work and service of the Church which calls him to enter the ranks of her ministry—how can these be exhibited without portraying the divine origin, the special mission, and the glorious consummation, designed to be accomplished by the Church of Christ, and without an acquaintance with the history, distinguishing characteristics, achievements and field of usefulness offered him by the Church to whose ministry he proposes to devote his life?

In giving, developing and responding to a call to the ministry, three parties are specially interested—God, the person called, and the Church. God, through creation, confers the necessary natural talents; through his Son he redeems the candidate, through the Scriptures commands him to believe in Christ, to consecrate himself to the service of God, and to glorify him in eating, in drinking, and in all other things; through the Holy Spirit he works faith, renews and sheds abroad the love of God and man in the heart, leads him into the kingdom of God, induces him to choose the ministry, and to devote his life to winning souls. Through Providence he preserves his health and life, directs him to suitable fields of labor, and opens to him doors of usefulness. The Church must call into requisition all the agencies and instrumentalities, and put forth all the efforts, required to develop the talents and graces conferred, that it may become manifest to her, that this and that young man, found in her families, congregations, schools and colleges,

possesses the necessary, natural, spiritual and acquired attainments to qualify him for the ministry and by her counsels, instructions and prayers, render him such assistance as will enable him to form an intelligent judgment that he is called to the ministry. And the candidate must so appreciate the instructions and heed the advice of the Church, as to respond to her call for laborers and enter her service as an ambassador of Christ.

OF THE CHURCH CALLING HER ELECT SONS INTO THE MINISTRY.

God having conferred the natural talents and spiritual gifts adapted to qualify many of the sons of the Church for the office of the ministry, it becomes her bounden duty to call them out and employ them in her service. Among the agencies and institutions through which she is to supply herself with an adequate number of well-qualified ministers, we mention—

1. *The Family.* God instituted marriage, and founded the family as the home of childhood, the guardian of youth, and the nursery of the ministry. In order to attain this exalted end, it is manifest that the family must be constituted according to the Christian ideal. The parents should be intelligent and pious—should consecrate their children to God in holy baptism, that the blessings of the covenant of grace may be sealed unto them—and recognize him at the domestic altar. They should bring them under the constant influence of Christian nurture, involving religious instruction, faithful discipline, and a consistent example, that they may become wise unto salvation through faith in Jesus Christ. They should keep constantly before the minds of their children the ultimate end of life, to glorify God, and make well-directed efforts to induce them to devote themselves to its attainment by cultivating excellency of character and doing good. They should give special heed to the constitutional peculiarities, disposition, bent of mind, tastes, or genius, adapting them for some particular trade, profession or business, and give them timely counsel in choosing an honorable and useful calling, as well as afford them the necessary facilities to prepare them to engage in it. They should consider the claims of the ministry as a profession affording opportunities of highest usefulness and possessing corresponding attractions, recog-

nize the probability that one or more of their sons may possess the requisite talents and graces to fit him or them for its prosecution, and endeavor by advice, instruction and assistance, to lead them to devote their lives to the glorious work of saving souls.

2. *The Congregation.* The Christian congregation, as a supernatural organism, is the legitimate outgrowth of the family, and becomes its indispensable auxiliary in calling forth ministers. Provision should, therefore, be made by every congregation to furnish a due proportion of candidates for the ministry. Sunday or parochial schools, or both, should be established, in which the religious training begun in the family may be carried forward in forms adapted to the growth and mental development of youth. Catechetical instruction should be maintained, every pastor diligently prosecute it, and every baptized child brought by parental authority under its moulding and indoctrinating influence. It should be taken for granted that there are some young men in every congregation, who possess the natural and spiritual endowments constituting the marks of a call to the ministry; and Sunday-school teachers and officers, elders and deacons, pastors and church members, should regard it their duty to look after talented, pious young men, call their attention to the claims of the ministry, and in all rational and scriptural ways endeavor to convince them that the Master has need of them, and calls them to labor in his vineyard. The call to and the supply of the ministry should constitute subjects for occasional discussion in the pulpit; regular and liberal contributions should be made to beneficiary education, and the prayer: "Lord, send forth laborers into thy harvest," should find frequent utterance from every Christian lip, in the closet and at the family altar, no less than in meetings for social prayer, and in the supplications of the great congregation engaged in public worship.

3. *The School.* As education consists in cultivating all the intellectual and moral faculties of the soul in due proportion, all schools designed to impart it must adopt such a course of instruction as will be adapted to the attainment of the ultimate end of education, which is character. Every school, whether popular or academic, that discards moral and religious instruc-

tion, cannot be adapted to the training of the sons of the Church, among whom she must look for her candidates for the ministry.

The American system of popular education is acknowledgedly characterized by many excellencies. Its greatest deficiency is found in its want of adequate religious instruction. In a great majority of our public schools the Bible is read, the Lord's Prayer repeated, and a general religious impression made, but it cannot be claimed that this is all the moral instruction needed by the American citizen, and much less than that which the Church should be satisfied to secure for the children she has dedicated to God and covenanted to bring up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. From many public schools, however, the Bible has been excluded, and no religious instruction whatever is given to the pupils. If this process of divesting our public schools of their religious character should continue, and the American system of popular education become thoroughly secularized, the Church cannot safely patronize them; and if she cannot redeem and make them Christian, she will be compelled to fall back on the parochial system, and establish not only her own colleges and academies, but also her own parochial schools—as indispensable to the proper education of her sons called to the ministry.

4. *The College.* The course of education commenced in the parochial or common school, and continued in the academy or high school is completed in the college, which becomes one of the most important agencies, not only in giving candidates for the ministry the necessary literary outfit, but also in multiplying their number. Most of their students are distinguished by a thirst for knowledge, and a due appreciation of higher education, and among them a considerable proportion are found possessing the requisite natural talents, which, if properly cultivated and sanctified, would fit them for the work of the ministry. Some of them, although dedicated to the service of God in baptism, have not yet voluntarily confirmed the vows made by their parents in their name. Others, who have already become pious and united with the Church, have not yet chosen a profession, in which to prosecute their life work. The college accordingly becomes a nursery, where the sons of the Church, as choice

household plants, are set out, and subjected to the highest mental and moral culture, and among whom the Church must look for the evidences of a call to the ministry and induce them to enter her service.

The establishment of an adequate number of well manned and adequately endowed colleges, becomes a necessity to every Christian denomination; and upon their religious character, the bearing of their pious students, and the efforts made by their instructors, will depend their efficiency and usefulness in educating and multiplying the number of able and successful ministers of the Gospel. A high standard of piety should be maintained by the professors of religion in colleges, that the students having the ministry in view may be led to carry out their purpose to enter it. Those known as candidates for the holy calling should set such an example of Christian consistency in their walk and conversation, that they may not become a reproach and by-word to the impenitent and a stumbling block to pious students who have not yet decided the question of a profession for life. Ordinary, as well as special efforts should be made by the pastors of college churches, the president and the professors, to bring the non-professing young men under their care to a saving knowledge of Christ. The claims of the ministry as a profession, adapted to the attainment of greatest usefulness, should at all suitable times be presented, and such counsel and instruction given to those exhibiting the natural and spiritual traits, indicative of a call to the ministry, as will enable them to come to an intelligent, conscientious, and satisfactory conclusion, that it is their duty to become ministers of the Gospel.

5. *The Pulpit.* The pulpit is made to stand by metonymy for the preacher, the sermon and everything else pertaining to the ministry. As pastors of congregations and representatives of the whole Church, they are charged with the duty of giving succession to the ministry, which requires careful observation, sound judgment, and the application of necessary tests. The natural and spiritual qualifications for which they must look, as manifest indications of a call to the ministry, are specifically set forth in the Scriptures; and it is expressly enjoined upon them to exercise proper caution, subject to adequate trials, and guard

against undue haste in committing the ministerial office, "by the laying on of hands," to their successors. Ministers should take a deep interest in the lambs of the flock, notice children in their visitations, keep an eye on the boys in school and young men in college; and those, in whom they discover the natural and spiritual qualifications adapted to the prosecution of the work, they should endeavor to convince that they are called to the office of the ministry. They should place a due estimate upon the ministerial profession, make themselves thoroughly acquainted with, and inculcate correct views concerning it in their conversations, ministrations and writings.

The indirect influence of the pulpit in calling forth ministers is no less important. As the sons of the Church, elect of God, are to be nurtured in the family, trained in the congregation, and educated in the school and the college, and as the manifestations of the marks, as well as the number and character of the ministry, depend upon the efficiency of religious training and Christian education, it follows that just in proportion as pastors labor to promote Christian nurture in the family, to elevate the standard of intelligence and piety in the congregation, and to improve moral and religious instruction imparted in popular and parochial schools, academies and colleges, in that proportion will the number and character of candidates for the ministry be increased and elevated. No greater service than this can the pulpit render to the Church, and the low estimate placed upon the ministry, and its consequent general neglect, must be set down among the principal causes that have led to the paucity and inefficiency of ministers.

6. *The Press.* The press is the most important of modern inventions in stimulating, preserving, and communicating knowledge, and the Church has wisely availed herself of its almost omnipresent influence in every department of her work. She has accordingly provided herself with a religious literature, priceless in value, and all-permeating and powerful in its influence. In the form of books, she has treasured up and disseminated a permanent and sanctified literature, and through her periodicals she has supplemented and greatly widened the sphere

of her influence; and the bearing of both forms of religious literature upon the increase of the number and the elevation of the character of the ministry, is very great. Distinct treatises on the ministry, the symbolical writings of her confessors, the works of her theologians, the discourses of her great preachers, the achievements of her pastors and churches recorded by her historians, and the commentaries of her expositors, are all calculated to set forth the nature, character, qualifications, usefulness, and claims of the ministry, and to exert a corresponding influence on all Christians interested in and obligated to take part in calling forth candidates, and in advancing the standard of ministerial qualifications.

The weekly church paper, originated in America, and scarcely three-quarters of a century old, has not only become an indispensable means of spreading religious intelligence, cultivating personal piety, fostering the spirit of liberality, and stimulating Christian activity in every department of church work, but has also proven the most efficient auxiliary to the agencies heretofore mentioned in calling the attention of the churches to the deficiency in the ministry, and in urging the duty of making intelligent and constant effort to increase their number and improve their character and efficiency. These important results are attained by the church paper, through the publication of articles on the call and other aspects of the ministry, reports of the contributions made and the number of beneficiaries supported by our synods, the number of theological students sustained by their parents, the proportion among the young men in our preparatory schools and colleges having the ministry in view, the notices of licensures and ordinations taking place at our synodical meetings, the destitution in our own and the still greater destitution in foreign lands, the calls of our missionary boards and their secretaries for more men, accounts of missionary meetings at synods and conventions, reports of home and foreign missionaries, as well as references to the writings of ministers, and their addresses and sermons on special occasions, the labors of pastors and missionaries at home and abroad, with the additions made to their congregations, reports of revivals of religion, in which scores and even hundreds are brought to the

knowledge of the truth and gathered into the kingdom of God, together with such other articles bearing more or less directly on the ministry, and such other items of Church intelligence, as are calculated to foster church love, religious enterprise, and Christian benevolence, and referring more or less directly to the subject and claims of the ministry. On this wise, the church paper sounds the call of Jesus addressed to talented and pious young men: "Son, go work to-day in my vineyard." It becomes an assistant to parents in the family and to pastors in the congregation, and a co-worker with the teacher in the school and the professor in the college, in calling forth and educating an adequate number of able ministers to preach the gospel to every creature, and convert the world to Jesus Christ, who is "head over all things to the church," "God blessed forever."

The truth of this theory may be argued:

1. *From Scriptural Analogy.* The ordinary call to accept the Gospel embraces the general call, to believe in Christ, and to go into his vineyard and work, as well as the special call to perform such a part of the work required as each one was specially fitted for. In this manner members of the church at Jerusalem received and responded to the general gospel call, but when the special work of distributing alms was required, a certain number of them received a specific call to attend to it, the qualifications required were pointed out by the apostles, the Church directed to choose them, and when thus chosen the apostles set them apart to their work. In this manner the office of deacon was instituted and the call to the deaconship developed by the Church. A special service of a similar character was called for among the women, then secluded from the ordinary society of men. Certain qualifications were required, those possessing them were regarded as called to engage in it, and the Church appointed them. Thus the office of deaconesses arose and pious women were called to fill it.

2. *From Scriptural Precedent.* The informing or governing idea of the call to the ministry, viz, that of special fitness for the performance of its duties, runs through the procedure of God in calling Christ, of Christ in calling the evangelists and the apostles, and of the apostles in calling pastors, and other officers

to the performance of specific services in the Church. God, the Father, having determined to redeem the world, needed a Redeemer. Finding the qualifications necessary to accomplish it in his Son, he called him to the work of redemption, and when he communicated the call to him, the Son responded: "Lo, I come, in the volume of the book it is written of me to do thy will, O God!" And he accordingly expressly declared to the Jews, "I came not of myself, but the Father sent me."

A special service became necessary, viz, to make known and to prepare the way for the coming of Christ to certain places in Palestine. The Saviour apprehended the qualifications required to perform it, and finding them in the seventy disciples, he sent them forth as his evangelists.

Witnesses of his resurrection, and mediums of divine revelation, were necessary to establish the Christian Church. In the twelve apostles and in Paul, Jesus discovered the requisite qualifications, in consequence of which he called them to the work of the apostleship.

As Jesus had called evangelists and apostles, so, too, did he authorize the apostles to call pastors, evangelists, teachers, prophets, "for the perfecting of the saints and the edifying of the body of Christ." And those in whom they found the necessary qualifications, through their own observation, inquiry among the members of the churches, or otherwise, they regarded as called of God to perform such parts of the work required as they were severally best fitted for, and through their own agency and the coöperation of the churches, they convinced those called of their duty, and induced them to devote themselves to the offices above designated.

3. *From the Analogy of Faith.* The truthfulness of any theory propounded in the domain of science can only be demonstrated by showing that all the facts pertaining to the subject accord with it. Newton, having conceived the theory of gravitation, viz, that the force of gravitation operates directly as the quantity, and inversely as the square of the distance, demonstrated its truth by showing that the movements of all the planets and their satellites accorded with it. In other words, when the subjective idea and the objective law correlate a theory is

demonstrated. The truth of the theory under consideration may be tested in the same manner. In order to demonstrate it, all the passages bearing on the call to the ministry must be collated, and interpreted by the theory, and if such interpretation accords with the principles of hermeneutics, the demonstration becomes complete, and theological truth is established.

Having subjected our theory to a partial induction, embracing scripture analogy and precedent, we now extend it to all other passages of Scripture having reference to it, and render it all comprehensive. We herewith give a number of them :

"No man taketh this honor unto himself, but he that is called as was Aaron," Heb. 5 : 4. A bishop then must not be a novice, apt to teach, a workman that needeth not be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth. They must also first be proved and have a good report from them that are without. (See 1 Tim. 3d c.) "But when it pleased God, who separated me from my mother's womb, and called me by his grace to reveal his Son in me, that I might preach him among the heathen ; immediately I conferred not with flesh and blood," Gal. 1 : 15, 16. "Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery," 1 Tim. 4 : 14. "Necessity is laid upon me, yea, woe is unto me, if I preach not the Gospel," 1 Cor. 9 : 16. "Lay hands suddenly on no man," 1 Tim. 3 : 22. "The things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also," 2 Tim. 2 : 2. "For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldst set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city, as I had appointed thee," Titus 1 : 5. "And when they (*i. e.* Paul and Barnabas) had ordained them elders in every church, and had prayed with fasting, they commended them to the Lord, on whom they believed," Acts 14 : 23.

From a careful examination of these passages, each class of which could have been considerably enlarged, the following points are clearly and consistently set forth : That no man has a right to take unto himself the office of the ministry at his own option or choice ; that those designed to preach the Gospel

must be called of God; that this call is not now given by him immediately, but mediately, through the Church, that is through her members or pastors; the qualifications, natural and spiritual for which the representatives of the Church must look and by which they are to be governed in their judgment and choice, are explicitly and fully set forth in the Scriptures; that both their qualifications and character must be proved, by the applications of the texts just referred to, not only before the eyes of the Church, but also of the world; that a number of constitutional and intellectual deficiencies and defects of character are also stated in the Scriptures, as constituting marks of unfitness for the ministry, and from the exhibitions of which, in any given case, they were to draw the conclusion, that such persons were not called to the ministerial office; that in accordance with these instructions, they should take adequate time in deciding every individual case, and lay hands suddenly on no man; that when all these requisitions had been fully complied with, *then, and then only*, were they authorized to commit the office of the ministry to such as proved themselves to be "faithful men," and worthy to be ambassadors of Jesus Christ; and that Paul and Barnabas, Timotheus and Titus, acted according to these directions, in selecting pastors for the congregations then organized, and by their instructions and example, settled the Scriptural theory of a call to the ministry, by which alone her elect sons can be called out, educated and ordained in sufficient numbers, not to supply her own pulpits, but to make known the glad tidings of salvation among all nations. It is hardly necessary to remind the reader that all the points just presented accord with the scripture precedents and examples heretofore set forth, and render our argument from the analogy of faith complete and conclusive. An attempt to make all this accord with the prevalent theory of a call to the ministry, might, indeed, be made, and by artfully mixing up references to examples of the extraordinary call like that of Paul cited above, through the direct influences of the Holy Ghost, with the ordinary call, mediately communicated by the Church, and developed by the ordinary influences of the Spirit through the truth, but such a course perverts the testimony of the Scriptures, con-

founds calls that are distinct, is illogical, and can never be established, and successfully carried out, as the present threatened famine in the ministry abundantly proves.

4. *From the Universality of the Priesthood of Believers.* In the Mosaic economy, the priesthood was confined to the tribe of Levi, and the high priesthood to the family of Aaron, and transmitted by natural descent, constituting an hereditary, sacerdotal order. The Romish Church modeled its priesthood after the Levitical pattern, constituting an indelible priesthood, or clerical order, according to which he who is "once a priest" remains "always a priest." Luther, under the guidance of the New Testament, held that all hereditary restrictions in the priesthood had been abrogated with the Jewish dispensation to which it belonged, and maintained that in the Christian economy all believers became priests. The positions taken by him, and the arguments by which he sustained them, are so characteristic and conclusive that we subjoin a translation of the principal parts thereof:

All Christians are priests through Christ; the preachers have only an ecclesiastical office. Christ is priest, therefore all Christians are priests; that this is a true and Christian inference is evident from Psalm 22 : 22 : "I will declare thy name unto my brethren," and again Ps. 45 : 7, "Therefore, God, thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows." That we are his brethren is effected alone through the new birth; therefore, we are also priests as he is, we are sons as he is, kings as he is. For he has "raised us up together and made us sit together in heavenly places," that "we should be made heirs" and that God should "with him also freely give us all things." Eph. 2 : 6, Tit. 3 : 7, Rom. 8 : 32. And we have besides also many similar scripture passages in which we are identified with Christ, as one bread, one drink, one body, one member with another, one flesh, bone of his bones; yes, that we have all things in common with him.

But let us proceed and prove also from the offices of the priests (as they are called) that all Christians are in the same way priests. The priestly offices are chiefly the following : teaching, preaching and proclaiming the word of God, baptizing, blessing

or administering the sacrament of the altar, binding and loosing from sins, praying for others, offering sacrifices, and judging all other doctrines and spirits.

The first and most important, upon which all the rest depends, is the teaching of the word of God. For with the word we teach, bless, bind and loose, baptize, offer sacrifice, judge and decide everything; so that we cannot at all withhold anything that belongs to a priest from him whom we entrust with the word. But this same word is the common heritage of all Christians, as Isaiah says, 54 : 13 : "And all thy children shall be taught of the Lord." Jer. 6 : 45, Rom. 10 : 17, Ps. 49 : 6 and following.

That the first office, namely, that *in the word of God*, is common to all Christians, is further improved by 1 Peter 2 : 9 : "Ye are a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people : that ye should show forth the praises of him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvelous light." Who are they, I beg of you, who are called from darkness into the marvelous light? Is it not all Christians? But Peter gives them not only the right but also a command, that they show forth the praises of God, which surely is nothing else than the preaching of the word of God. Now let them come along with their two sorts of priesthood, one spiritual and general, the other special and external, and pretend that Peter is here speaking of the spiritual priesthood. What is then the office of their special and external priesthood? Is it not to show forth the praises of God? But Peter here imposes this duty upon the spiritual and common priesthood.

Christ teaches the same through Matthew, Mark and Luke, when in instituting the holy supper he says : "This do in remembrance of me." But this remembrance is nothing else than the preaching of the word; for Paul thus explains it, 1 Cor. 11 : 26 : "As often as ye eat of this bread and drink of this cup, ye do proclaim the Lord's death till he come."

Now, to proclaim the Lord's death is the same as to show forth the praises of the Lord who has called us from darkness into his marvelous light. * * St. Paul also confirms the same truth, 1 Cor. 14 : 26, when he says to the whole Church and to

every individual Christian: "Every one of you hath a psalm, hath a doctrine, hath a tongue, hath a revelation, hath an interpretation." And in verse 31: "For all may prophesy, one by one, that all may learn and all may be comforted." Now, my dear friend, do tell me what he means when he says *every one*? What is the meaning of the little word *all*?

The second office is *baptizing*. They have themselves by daily custom made this general, even allowing women to perform it in cases of necessity.

The third office is that of *blessing or administering the holy bread and wine*. * * Christ said: "This do in remembrance of me." This he said to all who were present, and to all who thereafter should eat and drink of this bread and wine. * * Paul also witnesses to this 1 Cor. 11 : 23; Matt. 6 : 25.

The fourth office is *binding and loosing*. Here comes the word of Christ, Matt. 18 : 15, which he spake not only to the apostles, but to all the brethren. Also verses 17 and 18.

The sixth office is *praying for others*. But Christ gave to each and every one of his Christians a single daily prayer, which, of itself, sufficiently proves and confirms the truth that there is but one priesthood common to all.

The seventh and last office is that of *judging all doctrines*. John 10 : 5: "My sheep do not hear the voice of strangers." And Matt. 7 : 15: "Beware of false prophets." Matt. 16 : 6; Matt. 22 : 2, 3; John 6 : 45.

We are told, Matt. 23 : 8: "One is your master, even Christ, but ye are all brethren." Therefore we are all equal and we have all only *one* right. For it is not to be at all endured that, among those who are called brethren, and who have all a common inheritance, one should be above another, should receive a larger share and have a better prerogative than another, especially in spiritual matters, of which we are now speaking.

Now, what we have here said has reference only to the common right and power of all Christians. For, although all the things we have mentioned are said to be common to all Christians (as we have indeed shown and proved), yet it is not becoming in any one to put himself forward and appropriate to

himself what belongs to us all. You may assume this right and exercise it where there is no other one who has received such a right. But the right of the community demands that one, or as many as the congregation may please, be chosen and appointed, who, in the stead and in the name of all the rest who have the same right, may publicly perform the functions of these offices, so that there arise no abominable confusion among the people of God, and that the Church, in which all things should be done decently and in order, as the apostle teaches, 1 Cor. 14 : 40, be not changed into a Babel. It is one thing for a man to exercise, by the authority of the congregation, a right that is common to all, and it is quite another thing for him to assume for himself to do it in a case of necessity. In a congregation where the right is free to all, no one should assume the exercise of it without the will and choice of the whole congregation; but in a case of necessity any one who chooses may avail himself of it.

Now I think it clearly appears from all this that those who administer the word and sacraments to the people neither can nor should be called priests. If they are called priests, that is done either in imitation of the heathen or it is a remnant of the laws of the Jewish people; hence it has wrought great harm to the Church. But in accordance with scripture usage they should rather be called servants, deacons, bishops, stewards, who also in view of their age are called presbyters, *i. e.* elders; for Paul says, 1 Cor. 4 : 1, "Let a man so account of us as of the ministers of Christ and stewards of the mysteries of God." (He did not say—regard us as the priests of Christ; he knew very well that the name and office of priest was common to all). Hence comes that familiar word of Paul, *dispensation*, or in Greek, *οἰκονομία*; in German, *haushalten*, [stewardship]; also, *ministerium*, minister; in German *dienst* [service]; *amt* [office], and *diener* [servant].

If then they are merely servants, then there is an end, too, of the ineradicable mark of their priesthood, and of the perpetuity of their priestly dignity. That one must always remain a priest is an invention; on the other hand, a servant can be dismissed if he prove no longer faithful. But he can be kept in office as

long as he is deserving and is satisfactory to the congregation, just as every one who, among equal brothers, exercises a common office among them in secular affairs.

We have here learned, clearer than the day and more surely than sure, whence we are to take the priests or servants of the word; namely, we are to elect them from the mass of Christ's followers, and nowhere else. For, as it has been sufficiently proved that every one has the right to administer the word, yes, that it is his duty to do so if he sees that either there is no other one at hand to do it, or that those who do are teaching wrongly, as Paul states, 1 Cor. 14 : 27 sq., so that the praise of God may be shown forth by us all; how much more should not a whole congregation have the right, and this duty too, that by a general election it could commit such an office to one or more in its stead, and set these apart as office-bearers over the others with their consent.

This is what Paul does, 2 Tim. 2 : 2, when he says: "The same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also." Here Paul throws aside all ceremony—cares for no consecration, demands only such as are capable of teaching, and all he wants is that to them alone the word be committed. When thus the office of the word is conferred upon some one, there are conferred with it all the offices that are administered by means of the word in the Church, *i. e.*, the authority to baptize, to bless, to bind and loose, to pray, and to judge or decide. For the office of preaching the Gospel is the highest of all.

Condition. Although every one has authority to preach, yet we should not employ any one to do it, and no one should undertake to do it, unless he be better fitted for it than others. And others should give way to him, so that suitable honor, discipline and order be observed. For thus Paul commands Timothy, 2 Tim. 2 : 2, that he should commit the preaching of the word to those who were fitted for it, and could teach and instruct others. For he who is to preach should have a good voice, a good delivery, a good memory, and other natural gifts. If any one has not these, he will do better to be quiet and let another speak.

The Lutheran Church adopted Luther's doctrine of the uni-

versality of the priesthood, according to which all believers become priests of Christ, and each one is called to perform that part of the work for which he is peculiarly fitted.

According to this view, the ministry does not constitute a peculiar order, but an office of special service in the Church, to which all are called who possess the requisite qualifications to "labor in word and doctrine." It accordingly becomes the duty of the Church to look out for the scriptural marks of a call to the ministry, and endeavor to induce an adequate number of the universal priesthood to respond to her call to devote themselves to the office of the Christian ministry. Although all believers are priests, and each one is endowed with the functions of the common priesthood, nevertheless, as all are not endowed with the qualifications necessary to the exercise of the functions of the ministry, it becomes necessary for the common priesthood or Church to invest those specially qualified to preach the Gospel and administer the sacraments, with the prerogatives of the ministry, through ordination conferred by the laying on of the hands of the presbytery or ministerium, and then to elect or call them to exercise the office of the ministry as pastors of their respective congregations, and to commission and send forth as many others as may be needed to supply the waste places at home and in foreign lands.

4. *From the Lutheran Doctrine of the Ministry.* This is stated in the Symbolical Books as follows:

God has appointed the ministry to preach the Gospel and administer the sacraments. Aug. Conf.

"Concerning Ecclesiastical Orders, they teach that no man should publicly in the Church, teach, or administer the sacraments, except he be regularly called." A. C., Art. XIV.

"The Church has the command of God to appoint preachers and deacons. While this is very precious, we know that God will preach and work through men, and those who have been elected by man." Apology, Art. IV.

"The churches undoubtedly retain the authority to call, to elect and to ordain ministers. And this authority is a privilege which God has given especially to the Church, and it cannot be

taken away from the Church by any human power as Paul testified, Eph. 4 : 8, 11, 12." Smalcald Articles.

Schmid, in his Dogmatic, summarizes the Lutheran doctrine of the ministry as follows: "This office is, therefore, one of divine appointment, and God has, at times, himself called single individuals into it; while now he does it only mediately, namely, through the Church, which has received from him the right and the authorization to do it." "Individual teachers must now, therefore, have received their call and authorization from the Church, if they are to have legitimately the right to teach and administer the sacraments." We subjoin but a few quotations from those given by Schmid, to sustain the statements quoted above. "By the divine call is understood the appointment of a certain and suitable person to the ministry of the Church, made by God, either alone, or by the intervening judicial aid of men." *Hollaz.*

"God calls men to the ecclesiastical office, sometimes immediately, as Moses and the apostles, and at other times mediately, viz, through the Church, which in the name of God commits this office to certain persons." *Baier.*

"An immediate call is not to be expected in the Church to-day." *Hollaz.*

"The difference between the mediate and immediate call consists always and only in this, that the former is effected through ordinary means, divinely appointed for this purpose, but the latter through God himself. The mediate call, therefore, is to be considered no less a divine call—for it is referred to God as its author—it is based upon apostolic authority—and the same promises belong to those thus called." *Gerhard.*

"The less (or minor) principal cause constituting the ministry is the Church, to which the right has been granted by God of electing, ordaining and calling suitable ministers of the divine word—nevertheless with the observance of becoming order in the exercise of this right. Therefore the examination, ordination and inauguration belong to the presbytery, and the consent, vote and approval to the people." *Hollaz.*

From the above quotations, the Lutheran doctrine, concerning the call and office of the ministry, may be summarily set

forth as follows: That Jesus Christ, the head of the Church, has conferred the power of calling pastors to preach the Gospel, administer the sacraments and discipline, and ordain ministers, upon the whole Church. Under the proper distribution of the powers, thus conferred, the right to call or elect their own pastor belongs to the laity, and the authority to preach the Gospel, ordain pastors, administer ordinances, and enforce discipline, is ordinarily vested in the ministry.

The "whole Church," is made up of congregations, congregations of families, and families of members. All church members are invested with the same prerogatives, and obligated to discharge the same duties. As each member is interested in the ministry and partakes of the benefits conferred by their labors, so too is each one privileged and bound to take part in looking out for those young men, who give evidence of possessing the natural talents and spiritual graces, which, if cultivated by education and the means of grace, would fit them for the work of the ministry. And as parents, teachers, professors, church officers, and pastors, are brought into frequent and intimate contact with boys and young men of riper age, it becomes their special duty, to improve the advantages thus afforded them, and by their counsels and instructions, assist those adapted by nature and grace for usefulness in the church, to come to an intelligent conclusion that they are called to the ministry, and to induce them to prepare themselves to labor in the vineyard of Christ. And having in these and other ways taken part in multiplying the number, and improving the character and efficiency of the ministry, they are permitted to exercise the right of electing pastors to exercise ministerial functions in their respective congregations.

ARTICLE VIII.

NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

FUNK & WAGNALLS, 10 & 12 DEY ST., NEW YORK.

Homiletics. By James M. Hoppin, Professor in Yale College. pp. 809. 1883.

For a full and systematic treatment of the subject of Homiletics, this work, in its present revised shape, ought to prove satisfactory to every preacher and student of theology. Beginning with an excellent introductory chapter on the importance of the ministerial office, the natural gifts and thorough training required, and the moral qualifications necessary, Professor Hoppin devotes 230 pages to the history of preaching—a fair-sized book in itself and worthy of a pupil of Neander. He then takes up in order the object of preaching, preparation for composing sermons, analysis and composition of sermons, classification of sermons, general principles of rhetoric, invention, style. There is a thoroughness of treatment in all these divisions that will satisfy the most exacting. It is evident that the work is the growth of years—the combined and well matured preparations of Professor Hoppin for his theological classes.

The discussion of those portions of his subject, concerning which there is a difference of opinion or of practice, is that of a judge and not of an advocate who has a special cause to maintain. Hence there is a freedom from dogmatic assertion and hobby-riding which is highly gratifying. After presenting one side, he proceeds on the principle of *audi alteram partem* and, after giving each side *pro* and *con*, he either leaves the conclusion to the reader or draws one himself that is fairly legitimate. The reader will be specially impressed with this in the section on the method of delivery, divided into (1) written sermons, (2) memoriter preaching, (3) extempore preaching.

Prof. Hoppin is thoroughly familiar with the literature of his subject not only in English but in French and German also. Not the least valuable feature of his work, indeed, is the list of works of reference on the different portions of the main topic, and his apt quotations from them. In short, with this book in hand, the theological student is well equipped for the study of the whole subject.

The Bible-Work, (or Bible Readers' Commentary). The New Testament, in Two Volumes. Vol. I, The Fourfold Gospel. With Illustrations, Maps and Diagrams. Prepared by J. Glentworth Butler, D. D. pp. 685. 1883.

Here is an excellent work for all classes of Bible students, whether they belong to the clergy or laity. It is a continuous narrative, made up from

the four gospels and presenting the life of Christ in the order of its events. This narrative, however, is given in short sections with ample explanations and comments, not by Dr. Butler alone, but by far the greater part selected by him from the best writings of religious authors since the gospels were written. Every source of information has been put under tribute, and we have here, not a disjointed commentary or mass of rich thought thrown in at random, but arranged and systematized, verse by verse, with rare discrimination. The sifting process has been done with a thoroughness that gives only the best. The general *readings*, given at the close of the respective sections and before the comments on the special verses, are practical in their bearing and deserve special mention for their suggestiveness. They will set the reader thinking and many a sermon will be evolved from them.

Although not intended for reference but for continuous reading and study, and not professing to be a critical commentary, it will be found to meet these ends in an eminent degree. The selections are pervaded by the results of scholarly and critical investigation, and though not formally critical they have the best results of such study. We speak highly of the whole work because we are satisfied it deserves it, and feel sure it will be what every reader of the Bible wants in studying those portions of which it treats.

The Lamb in the Midst of the Throne : or the History of the Cross. By James M. Sherwood. pp. 525. 1883.

The design of this solid octavo from the pen of Dr. Sherwood is to present the glory of the Cross as the centre of redemption, embracing in its scope all truth, all worlds, all dispensations and all ages past and to come.

It may be regarded as a work on systematic theology. But it is really more than that. Its successive chapters take a wide range of discussion not only on doctrinal questions but on numerous practical aspects which indicate the relations of modern society to the work of salvation.

The volume is the outcome of a long and earnest ministry in the pulpit and in the press, giving the accumulated studies, experiences and observations of many years. As may be anticipated the author writes now in the kindly patronizing spirit of a father, now with the temper of a rigid censor severely castigating some manifestations in Church and society which he regards as highways to perdition. Dr. Sherwood evidently belongs to those conservatives to whom the past is very roseate and the present very sombre—yea black with portentous clouds. His eye is so absorbed with the elements of evil at work everywhere, that he overlooks the mighty and hallowing forces which are conserving society to-day and which give no symptom of early decay. Possibly it is no heresy to hold that the standard of a past generation may not serve in all respects for the standard of the present, and that the clamor for the old paths might be safely exchanged for a little zeal in straightening and mending them. Wisdom

has never yet perished from the earth and it will hardly be extinct when the last representative of the generation now vanishing shall have disappeared.

His dolorous view of the present phase of things is happily relieved by the author's strong delineation of the revealed purposes and explicit promises of God, which dispel all darkness and maintain in the soul the most assured hopes. The volume must in this way prove to many a strong confirmation of their faith—and is to be commended as a valuable addition to the library of all ministers and intelligent laymen.

The Inner Life of Christ, as Revealed in the Gospel of Matthew. By Joseph Parker, D. D., Minister of the City Temple, Holborn Viaduct, London, author of "Ecce Deus," "The Paraclete," "The Priesthood of Christ," etc. Vol. II, "Servant of All." pp. 376. 1883.

The first volume of the "Inner Life of Christ," entitled "These Sayings of Mine," met with an enthusiastic reception everywhere. This second volume, entitled "Servant of All," will doubtless meet with a welcome none the less hearty, for it will be found to possess all the merits of the first. The freshness and vivacity of expression, the appropriate and striking figures, the rich and sparkling thought, the appreciation of human needs and sympathy with them—all appear in every discourse. There is not a dull page in the book. The glow of the author's heart is communicated to the reader, who reads on and on, reluctant to lay it aside. The great reputation of the distinguished London preacher will be further enhanced by this volume. Not the least of its merits is its suggestiveness. So rich is it, indeed, in this respect, that we feel like naming it as its most striking characteristic. Let the preacher, who wants a subject for a sermon, read a few pages of Dr. Parker's glowing thought, and we are quite sure he will have more than one suggested to him. But with all its picturesqueness and suggestiveness it is so eminently practical, that it cannot fail in leading to a deeper love for the "Servant of All" and to a higher plane of Christian life and service. It entertains, but entertainment is not its object: it aims rather at winning souls, and for this it is well adapted.

From Gloom to Gladness: Illustrations of Life from the Biography of Esther. By Rev. Joseph S. Van Dyke, A. M., author of "Popery the Foe of the Church and of the Republic," "Through the Prison to the Throne," "Giving or Entertainment—Which?" etc. pp. 269.

This consists of discourses on the Book of Esther, a portion of the Bible that receives too little attention. Regarding Ahasuerus as the celebrated Xerxes, the author makes an attractive web of history into which he weaves many practical and pointed illustrations of life, which will not fail to make a deep impression. This, indeed, is evidently his intention; and he finds the Gospel here as well as in the less historical portions of the Scriptures.

There is considerable repetition of some points but, notwithstanding this, the reader will find this a volume of uncommon interest.

The Blood of Jesus. By Rev. William Reid, M. A. With an Introduction by Rev. E. P. Hammond. pp. 107.

We have here eleven chapters on the general subject of the atonement. They have, for the most part, the tone of revival sermons, and seem well adapted for producing conviction of sin and leading the penitent to the great sin bearer. It is a little book that has found a wide circulation in Great Britain and is well worth reprinting in America.

Gathered Lambs. By Rev. Edward Payson Hammond. pp. 172.

The Child's Guide to Heaven, or Stories for Children. By Rev. E. Payson Hammond. pp. 63.

Mr. Hammond has apparently met with considerable success as an evangelist among children, and these two little books record his success and give us some of the stories he has told. The *ego* in them is a little too conspicuous for a humble winner of souls,

Nature Studies. By Grant Allen, Andrew Wilson, Thomas Foster, Edward Clodd, and Richard A. Proctor.

India, What Can It Teach Us? By Max Muller.

Winter in India. By the Rt. Hon. W. E. Baxter, M. P.

Scottish Characteristics. By Paxton Hood.

Historical and Other Sketches. By Jas. Anthony Froude.

Jewish Artisan Life in the Time of Christ. By Franz Delitzsch, D. D.

Scientific Sophisms. By Samuel Wainwright, D. D.

These belong to the "Standard Library" published by Funk & Wagnalls, and are Nos. 12-18 of the 1883 series. The mere names of the authors are a sufficient guarantee of the excellence of the books. Issued at such cheap rates, they have, and ought to have, a wide circulation. All those we have named are 25 cents each, except "Jewish Artisan Life" which is 15 cents.

LUTHERAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY, PHILA.

The Life of Martin Luther. By Julius Köstlin, Professor at Halle. Translated from the German. Edited by John G. Morris, D. D., LL. D. Beautifully illustrated. pp. 496. 1883.

"Magnificent!" must be the expression of many as their eyes fall upon this large and beautiful volume which in mechanical execution exceeds beyond comparison all previous publications of the Lutheran Board. We doubt whether anything pertaining to the grand Reformer ever appeared in a more elegant garb. It is the first volume devoted to him in English that we regard worthy of his memory. This is as true of the internal contents as it is of the binding, paper and letter-press. It is a noble biography.

The highest expectations had been created by the fame of the original,

for which, Froude says, Europe has waited 400 years, by the well-known ability of the editor, and by the enthusiasm of this Luther Year which can brook no inferior tribute to his imperishable name, but these expectations concerning the work will find their full realization in the perusal of its clever and stirring pages. The editor may now be justified in singing his "Nunc dimittis." Of all his valuable contributions to Lutheran literature this is the volume which will carry his name the farthest around the earth and the furthest down the stream of time. Thousands of delighted readers will say: God bless Doctor Morris for giving to our own tongue this most excellent Life of Luther. We are sorry, only, that his own hands could not execute the entire translation of the original, or, this not being practicable, that as editor he failed to give the work of some of his assistants a thorough revision before "it was too late to make more changes." As he admits in the preface, some sentences might have been improved and some German idioms might have been more Anglicised. One of these assistants was entirely too conscientious in preserving "already" as often as it occurs in German. Its frequent and awkward occurrence is sure to betray the original which a good translation should always disguise. One mistakes the German "Dom"—cathedral, for the English "dome"—cupola, p. 218. The expression on p. 232, "The anathema which had expired with reference to Luther" must be a serious mistranslation. The original term translated "expired" is doubtless "verfallen," a word which even an ordinary dictionary will show to be used in widely different senses. It was the issuing not the expiration of the anathema that failed "to frighten away the multitude of students."

However, in the face of the general excellence of the work in its English garb, these minor defects fade out of view like reputed spots in the sun. Its extraordinary value remains. Its issue is most timely. The American celebration of the four hundredth anniversary of Luther's birth is just at its height—and here is the very memento which the English-reading public craves in its enthusiasm. A New York or Boston house would sell 25,000 copies of the work before the close of 1883—though doubtless at a lower figure than that for which it is now offered. No doubt the energetic agent of the Lutheran Board will know how to push it over the whole land and make its revenue bear some proportion to its merits.

Europe through a Woman's Eye. By Mrs. Lucy Yeend Culler. With an Introduction by Rev. Prof. W. H. Wynn, Ph. D. pp. 225. 1883.

Next to taking a three or four months tour through Europe for sight-seeing, is sitting down with such a book as this and looking at things through another's eyes. Especially is this true when the other eyes are those of an observant, wide-awake, appreciative woman. Such evidently is Mrs. Culler, wife of Rev. J. H. Culler, of Newton, Iowa, who with her husband spent the summer of 1882 in European travel, leaving New York in the latter part of April and returning about the middle of September.

Naturally she has little to say about the agricultural, mechanical, commercial or political affairs of Europe, (and no one, whether woman or man, ought to say much about them after only a few months stay there) but she has a great deal to say, and she says it well, about the very things the Summer tourist wants to see and we who stay at home want to know. One of the best features about her story is, that she makes us feel that we are in the party and see what she sees. Her mountain climbing and ascent of Vesuvius are specially vivid and reveal an admirable courage on her part. We like the book and take pleasure in saying so. The introduction by Prof. Wynn is excellent.

Children's Memorial Service. To be used on the Anniversary of Luther's 400th Birthday. Price 5 cents; or \$2.50 per 100, postage prepaid. This service was prepared by Revs. S. B. Barnitz and G. U. Wenner, under the authority of the General Synod. It commends itself throughout as being admirably adapted for the purpose intended.

HARPER & BROTHERS, FRANKLIN SQUARE, NEW YORK.

The Moral Pirates, or the Cruise of the "Whitewing." By W. L. Alden. Illustrated. pp. 148. 1881.

The Cruise of the "Ghost." By the same. Illustrated. pp. 210. 1882.

The Cruise of the Canal Club. By the same. Illustrated. pp. 166 1882.

A correct estimate of these neat juvenile volumes might be given by the statement that they first appeared as serials in Harper's *Young People*. Rarely if ever do those widely-read columns contain anything but what is of first quality for children. We know furthermore of some lads who after reading these stories in *Young People* were not satisfied until they had them in book form, and now that they possess them they never tire of poring over their pages.

Mr. Alden has evidently a warm interest in boys and knows how to provide them with feasts at once wholesome and palatable. He gives the tale of a small group in their early teens who through the generous consideration of an uncle, spent their vacation cruising in a row-boat up the Hudson. The year following they advanced to a sail-boat, and cruised along the Long Island shore till they reached the ocean, and upon their return from this trip they secured each a canoe and launching them in Lake Memphramagog, they sailed back and forth in the St. Lawrence and its tributaries. The young sailors have considerable amusement in their novel experiences and some exciting and even thrilling adventures. They are very *moral pirates* who rove over the waters in quest of nothing but healthy and lively diversion—and who when the Lord's Day finds them away from their homes leave their tents and boats and repair to church. They are such characters as one would like to have his own children associate with and these stories of their voyages, with their genial and happy temper toward each other, their self-reliance and prudence in

perplexing moments, their bravery in danger, are calculated not only to fascinate young readers but to develop in them noble traits of character.

AMERICAN SUNDAY-SCHOOL UNION, PHILA.

The following books are in paper covers and belong to the "Robert Raikes Libraries," (Ten Cent Series). All were submitted to a competent committee before publication and may, therefore, be regarded suitable for the Sunday-school library. They are published weekly, and ten constitute a volume. Those we name here make up Vols. III and IV. The first appeared Nov. 18th, 1882, and the last, March 31st, 1883:

Life of George Washington.

What is Her Name? By Rev. Dr. Edersheim.

The Lost Key. By the Author of "The Little Watercress Sellers."

Amos Armfield; or *The Leather-Covered Bible.*

Ruth Lee; or *The True Secret of Cheerfulness.*

Kenneth Forbes; or *Fourteen Ways of Studying the Bible.*

Pierre and His Family; or *A Story of the Waldenses.*

Jessica's First Prayer and *Reuben Kent at School.*

The First Twenty Years of My Life. By Allen Richmond.

Nellie Gray; or *Ups and Downs of Every-day Life, and Their Lessons.*

Reuben Kent in the City.

The Way Made Plain. Parts First and Second, two volumes.

Alone in London.

Henry Martyn and His Missionary Work in the East. By Rev. John

Hull, D. D., of Trenton, N. J.

Jane Hudson; or *The Secret of Getting on in the World.*

Sunny Midge, the Light of the Household.

Ben Hott's Good Name and *Hungering and Thirsting.*

Matty Gregg; or *The Woman that Did What She Could.*

Jessie's Work; or *Faithfulness in Little Things. A Story for Girls.* By

Mary E. Shipley.

H. L. HASTINGS, CORNHILL, BOSTON.

A Critical Greek and English Concordance of the New Testament. Prepared by Charles F. Hudson under the direction of Horace L. Hastings, Editor of "The Christian." Revised and completed by Ezra Abbot, D. D., LL. D. Sixth Thousand. To which is added Greenfield's Greek and English Lexicon. pp. 508, 98. 1882.

What cultured minds need in the study of the New Testament is not so much a voluminous commentary as a Greek Lexicon and a Greek Concordance. These two aids would yield a much fresher and much truer knowledge of Holy Scripture than one can obtain from whole shelves of commentaries. Thus only can we rightly apply Luther's sterling maxim to make Scripture interpret Scripture.

The work before us must be commended as supplying a great want and that in a convenient form and at a moderate price. It is the first Greek-

English Concordance ever prepared in America and is the result of careful and prodigious labor. Its reliable and serviceable character may be inferred from the fact that the earlier editions were in constant use by the members of both the English and American companies in the recent revision of the New Testament. Among those who have given it their unqualified endorsement are such biblical scholars as Bishop Ellicott, Dr. Lightfoot, Prof. Westcott and Drs. Schaff, Dwight, Thayer and Riddle.

But its usefulness is not restricted to the learned. Even such as are not Greek scholars can learn the original Greek terms and note their sense and usage in the different books of the New Testament. No Bible student can afford to do without it. The addition of Greenfield's Lexicon will in the judgment of some enhance the value of this edition. Others may hope for an early law by Congress prohibiting any book or part of a book from being printed in diamond type. The Concordance and other parts of the work are in very clear and pleasant print.

G. W. FREDERICK, 117, N. 6TH ST. PHILADELPHIA.

A Memoir of the Life and Times of Henry Melchoir Muhlenberg, D. D. Patriarch of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. By Prof. M. L. Stæver, Ph. D., LL. D. New edition, pp. 120. 1883.

One of the best and most loving services rendered by Professor Stæver consisted in the biographical sketches of Lutheran ministers he wrote while connected with the *Evangelical Review*, the predecessor of the LUTHERAN QUARTERLY. So well and to such an extent did he perform this service that he was appropriately called "The Plutarch of the Lutheran Church in America." But of all his admirable sketches there was none better prepared or more valuable to the Church than that of the American Lutheran patriarch, Dr. H. M. Muhlenberg. This was first published in 1856, and now appears again, with G. W. Frederick as publisher, after being out of print for some time. Mr. Frederick was induced to this by the frequent inquiries made for the book, and he deserves the thanks of the Church for this new edition of it. It is issued at 75 cents per copy, and we hope it will have a large sale both on account of its own merits and value and as a fair recognition of Mr. Frederick's services in re-issuing it.

Lithographic Picture of C. P. Krauth, D. D., LL. D. This picture of the distinguished and lamented Krauth is by the well known firm of Lehman & Bolton, and in their best style. The size is 22x24 inches, on good paper. It is from one of the best photographs of Dr. K. and quite life-like. The price is 75 cents per copy.

PILGER BOOK STORE, READING, PA.

The Life of Dr. Martin Luther. Offered to the Lutheran Church in America by Prof. W. Wackernagel, D. D. Translated from the German by Prof. C. W. Schaeffer, D. D. With 45 illustrations. pp. 331. 1883.

In this the 400th anniversary of Luther's birth, the thought of the Pro-

testant world (and, indeed, the Roman Catholic too) is largely turned to the great reformer and the beneficent work he accomplished. It is fitting at such a period to have an accurate history of the heroic man who had the courage, with God's help, to withstand, at the peril of his life, the powerful of the earth, in defense of sacred truth. For a small work, this one prepared by Prof. Wackernagel is excellent. His picture of "The Dark Hour before the Dawn" and that of the condition of Germany about A. D. 1500 are exceedingly graphic, and form a fitting introduction to the advent of the man who led the world in its emancipation from popery. This style characterizes the book throughout, and the English translation by Dr. Schaeffer is so smooth and flowing that it cannot well be surpassed by the German in which it was written. Larger volumes on the life of Luther are in press or in the course of preparation, but there is a place for this in every Lutheran family in the land, yes every family whether Lutheran or not, for Luther belongs to the world.

My first book in Sunday-school and Home. Biblical Narratives given in very Simple Language. By Rev. S. E. Ochsenford. Together with Prayers and Hymns. pp. 72. 1883.

This little book has been judiciously prepared, and its use will undoubtedly be found profitable. Each brief narrative is followed by a series of questions which will likely prove helpful. The most of the pictorial illustrations are good.

LUTHERISCHER CONCORDIA-VERLAG, ST. LOUIS, MO.

(M. C. BARTHEL AGENT.)

Dr. Martin Luther's Haus-Postille, nach Veit Dietrich. Aufs Neue herausgegeben im Auftrag des Ministeriums der deutschen Ev. Luth. Synode von Missouri, Ohio und Andern Staaten. Quarto. pp. 1343 double column. 1883.

Luther was none of those preachers whose energies are so much absorbed by public duties that they feel compelled to neglect their own households. Here is a collection of his discourses which were delivered chiefly to the members of his family on the Lord's Day, when his infirmities prevented his appearance in the pulpit. They were preserved not from his own pen, but from that of his faithful amanuensis, Veit Dietrich, who was himself a long time an inmate of the Reformer's house, and who without the knowledge of Luther wrote them down as they fell from his lips. They embrace in their scope all sermons on the Gospels of all the Sundays and Festivals of the Church Year, thirteen on the passion of our Lord and some miscellaneous discourses. While constituting the first half of the XIIIth volume of Luther's works now being re-issued in splendid style by this house, the Dietrich Edition of the House-postils is here published as a separate volume "und zwar zugleich als Jubiläumsausgabe zum gedächtniss des 400 jährigen Geburtstags des Reformators." No better memorial of this year could have been offered to the public. That it may enter into thousands of German homes and serve as a powerful Gos-

pel haven to the domestic life of Lutherans must be the wish and prayer of all who are zealous for the honor of God in the family.

Church Liturgy. For Evangelical Lutheran Congregations of the Unaltered Augsburg Confession. Published by the German Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio and other States. Translated from the German. pp. 88.

Both the German copy and the English translation are well printed and gotten up in good shape. The contents are: Forms for Baptism of Infants, Attestation of Baptism, Baptism of Adults, Confirmation, Solemnization of Marriage, Communion of the Sick, Morning Service, Afternoon and Week Day Service, Catechetical Instruction, Short Service, Service for Confession, Early Communion, Burial, Day of Prayer and Repentance. In the Appendix are Antiphonies and Collects.

Lithographic Picture of Concordia Seminary. This is a very fine picture of a very large and fine-looking building. Augustus Gast is the lithographer, and he may be well satisfied with this sample of his work. The building is located in St. Louis, will accommodate 200 students, and is complete in all its arrangements. We congratulate our Missouri brethren on its completion.

Warum sollen wir uns Luther's, dessen namen wir tragen, nicht schämen? Predigt über 2 Tim. 1: 8, zur Nachfeier des Reformationsbestes von C. F. W. Walther. pp. 15.

The words "Gottes woot und Luther's Lehr' vergehet nun und nimmermehr" have been put in music and may be had from the above house.

SEVERINGHAUS & CO., CHICAGO, ILL.

The numerous Lutheran publishing establishments will soon require all the space of the REVIEW to notice their publications. Could they all be combined in one General Lutheran Book Concern it would eclipse everything else of the kind in this country. We have received from the above house a very interesting brochure entitled, *Dr. Martin Luther's "Ein feste Burg ist unser Gott,"* in 21 Sprachen. Zu seinem 400 jaehrigen Geburtstage. Herausgegeben von Pastor Dr. Bernhard Pick, verfasser von "Luther as a Hymnist." pp. 46. 1883. Besides the 19 translations into other tongues the volume contains 28 English versions, as well as a brief history of the origin of this imperishable battle song of the Reformation.

Also a neatly executed German Primer, *Das Erste Buch* in Sontagschule und Haus. Als Jubelsgabe für ev. Luth. Christenkinder. pp. 62. 1883.

THE LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN, COLUMBUS, OHIO.

The State, The Church, And The School. By C. H. L. Schuette, A. M., pp. 381. 1883.

In view of the recognized scholarship of the author, a Professor in Capital University, O., and the importance of the themes here discussed we

had hoped to give this volume a most thorough study and an extended review. Circumstances have prevented us from following or criticising the treatise throughout, but we have read enough of it to perceive the great merits by which it is characterized. The author takes sound positions and shows admirable capacity in maintaining them. He has clear views of the distinct spheres and limitations of the State, the Church and the School respectively, and of their divinely ordered relations to each other. The spread of these views may be of great service in developing enlightened citizenship, a hallowing ecclesiasticism and a model public school system.

For the present secular public schools Prof. Schuette has more good words to say than might have been anticipated from one who is so churchly. "Conformably to its office the State can be rightly intrusted with this work." Of course the State can educate only in matters of secondary importance, only in externals. But to "stigmatize secular schools as godless for no other reason than that they teach no religion, is a senseless and wrongful denunciation." A strong plea is made in behalf of the use of the Bible in every schoolroom, and that not only as a book of devotion, but as a daily text-book of instruction. Its merits as a history both sacred and profane, its biography, its superior literary qualities and its pure, lofty moral principles make it even apart from the revelation it contains, the first book in the world.

The QUARTERLY joins with many of the foremost journals of the country in heartily commending this volume to public attention. The Professors at Capital University, let it be known, are rapidly taking the front rank for authorship among the Lutheran institutions of this country. Let their meritorious productions stimulate others not to allow them a monopoly of this honor.

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, NEW YORK.

For sale by J. B. Lippincott & Co., Phila.

The Philosophical Basis of Theism. An Examination of the Personality of Man to ascertain his Capacity to Know and Serve God, and the Validity of the Principles underlying the Defence of Theism. By Samuel Harris, D. D., LL. D., Professor of Systematic Theology in the Theological department of Yale College. pp. 564. 1883.

In this substantial volume Dr. Harris has entered the arena of public discussion in the great problems that are chiefly agitating the thought of our age. And he has given us a work of fine ability, which cannot fail to serve the cause of truth. When the first truths of religion are assailed, as they often are now, under the cover of alleged science and philosophy, and many of the young especially, are in danger of being misled, we welcome such a clear and vigorous vindication of the foundations of theism as comes to us in this volume.

This book, the author tells us, has grown out of the discussions and lectures in the class-room. It is easy to see how the young men would find

them helpful and feel the desire which they expressed for their publication. The object of the work is, not to furnish a treatise on Natural Theology or give in formal way the evidences for the divine existence and character, but to investigate and assure the fundamental principles of knowledge on which such evidences must always rest. "It is designed," says the author, "to examine the constitution of man as a personal being in order to ascertain his capacity to know and serve God, to answer the philosophical questions involved in the controversy with skepticism, agnosticism, and materialism, and to set forth, clear from misapprehension, and vindicate the principles on which the defence of theism must rest. It is not intended to be a treatise on psychology, ethics or metaphysics. I have given psychological definitions and classifications so far as they are necessary to explain my use of terms. Aside from this I have confined myself to those topics, the right exposition of which is of critical significance in deciding the controversies now rife between Christian theism and unbelief in its various forms, and in the discussion of which I have hoped to contribute something to the clear and exact apprehension and the true and convincing answer to the questions at issue."

In pursuance of this plan, Dr. Harris begins with the question what knowledge is, and of its reality as a primitive datum of consciousness, impossible to be discredited without intellectual suicide. In noticing the criteria of primitive truths he makes a good point in the distinction he insists on between "inconceivability" and "the impossibility of conceiving the opposite." Writers are frequently found confounding this distinction. This chapter makes the self-destructive position of agnosticism very plain. The next chapter is occupied with the Acts and Processes of Knowing, presenting an excellent view of intuition or primitive knowledge, of representative knowledge, knowledge by reflection or thought, the various forms of thought, its relations to intuition and to the Universal Reason. Dr. Harris here justly and clearly points out the error of supposing that in religious apprehension "faith" precedes intelligence, or that a "faith-faculty" is the distinctive organ for the knowledge of God. He rightly adds: "The defenders of Christian theism, who admit that theism rests on a faith which is not knowledge, are misled by a false theory of knowledge and surrender the very citadel of their defences."

After treating of what is known through presentative intuition and rational intuition, Dr. Harris searches into the ultimate realities known through this latter and higher power. He finds five of these ultimate realities, viz: "The True, the contrary of which is the Absurd; The Right, the contrary of which is the Wrong; The Perfect, the contrary of which is the Imperfect; The Good, determined by the standard of Reason as having true worth or as worthy of the pursuit and enjoyment of a rational being, the contrary of which is the Unworthy, the Worthless, or the Evil; The Absolute or Unconditioned, the contrary of which is the Finite or Conditioned. The four first are the Norms or Standards of Reason, the basis of Mathe-

matics, of Logic, and of Speculative, Ethical, *Æsthetic* and Teleological Philosophy. The fifth as the Unconditioned and All-conditioning One stands by itself and is the basis of Theology." In his discussion of the norm of "the right," the author shows clearly how the ethical ideas are given in "rational intuition," and that the law of duty "requires conformity to the fundamental realities in the constitution of things." We are glad to see this sound teaching on this important point—teaching that in substance coincides with the view which bases the rightness of action on conformity to the real relations of men and as discovered by rational intuition. Dr. Harris gives no quarter to the theories that ascribe the moral ideas to association of ideas or education, to feeling, or derive the idea of right from that of happiness or utility, or make the distinction of right and wrong rest ultimately on the mere *will* of God. On this last point he says forcibly: "It is greatly to be lamented that this error has ever found foothold in Christian theology, with which it is essentially in conflict. It cannot be held, even as a speculative theory, without distorting and vitiating both the theology and the practical teaching of Christianity. It has led to bald and hard presentations of theology, incompatible with the essential truth and spirit of Christianity and with the best thought and the best piety of the ages."

The author discusses the different ultimate realities or norms of reason in order, and shows the validity of all the knowledge that underlies and forms immovable basis for our Christian theism.

Here and there throughout the volume we find positions taken and statements made, from which we must dissent. The immense number of topics, both psychological and metaphysical, traversed in such a discussion, inevitably raises questions on which readers will disagree. But the leading teachings of this book are so thoroughly sound, and its presentation of the fundamental principles of knowledge so clear and vigorous, that we desire to give it our cordial recommendation. It must rank among our ablest works on the great subject in discussion.

Corea: the Hermit Nation. I. Ancient and Mediaeval History. II. Political and Social Corea. III. Modern and Recent History. By William Elliot Griffis, late of the Imperial University of Tokio, Japan, author of "The Mikado's Empire." pp. 462. 1882.

Those who have read "The Mikado's Empire," published about seven years ago, will need no recommendation of this fine volume from Mr. Griffis' pen. They will find it marked by the same general features of excellence that gave the former work its acknowledged value. Recent and occurring events make this volume very opportune. It was only last year that Corea became accessible to Western commerce and civilization through treaties made, first with the United States, and then with England, Germany and France. Ever before that time it had been a strictly "hermit" nation, rigidly closed against foreigners. Indeed a law existed inflicting

death on any foreigner entering the country, and only by the operation of these treaties has the law been abrogated. At the present time a special Korean embassy is in our country, consisting of a Minister Plenipotentiary and an Assistant Minister, with a number of secretaries and attaches, for the purpose of perfecting commercial relations with the United States. At an interview of the embassy with President Arthur, which occurred a few days ago at the Fifth Avenue Hotel in New York city, the Minister, who is a relation of the Korean Queen, appeared in his richest robes of State, and presented the good wishes of his government, and the desire that the two nations might live in perpetual peace and happiness. Special interest has thus been awakened in the strange people of that far-off land which has at last yielded to the necessity of opening itself to the encroachments and progress of western civilization. The volume before us, therefore, answers the present need and desire for information concerning that country.

Mr. Griffis' object has been to give an outline of the history of the "Land of the Morning Calm"—as the natives call their country—from before the Christian era to the present time. Korea is a new field for the historian's investigations, and this volume appears as the first attempt to furnish a regular and systematic history of that land. The author possessed peculiar advantages for the task he set for himself. Having spent about four years in Japan, his proximity to the Korean peninsula opened to him special sources of information and awakened the liveliest interest in the subject. It must be said that he has done his work well. The volume everywhere bears evidence to the industry, care and faithfulness with which he has examined and used all accessible sources of information. It would be too much to expect that he has attained perfect accuracy in all points, or that some of his judgments may not need to be revised under future and better light. But his effort is an unquestionable success, and those who desire the best historical view of Korea must be directed to this work.

Under head of "Ancient and Mediæval History," the author has given an account of the geography of the Korean peninsula, of the race, and of "the old kingdom," and sketched, in general, the various changes down to 1668. In the part devoted to "Political and Social Korea," an immense amount of curious and interesting information is given, concerning the customs and habits of the people, the family, child life, housekeeping, diet, costume, burial, employments, folk-lore, proverbs, religion, education and culture. In the Modern and Recent Period, we have the story of the entrance and work of Roman Catholic missionaries in 1784, the subsequent efforts of the French missionaries, and the chief events, all full of historic interest, down to the signing of the treaty with the United States. Here Mr. Griffis closes with the words: "At this stage of affairs, when Korea ceases to be a 'hermit nation,' and stands in the glare of the world's attention, we bring our imperfect story to a close. The pivot of the future history of Eastern Asia is Korea. On her soil will be decided the problem of

the supremacy, by the jealous rivals China, Japan, and Russia. The sudden assumption of self-imposed tutelary duties by China proves her lively interest in the little country, which has been called both 'her right arm of defense,' and 'her gloved hand'—the one to force back the ravenous Muscovite, the other to warn off the ambitious Japanese. Whether the Middle Kingdom has deliberately chosen the Land of Morning Calm to affront and humiliate 'the neighboring disturbing nation,' that twice humbled her pride in the fairest island of the sea—Formosa and Riu Kiu—the events of the not distant future will soon determine. Whether the hoary empire shall come in collision with the young northern giant, and the dragon and the bear shall tear each other in the slime of war in Corean valleys, may be a question the solution of which is not far off. We trust that amid all dangers, the integrity of the little kingdom may be preserved; but whatever be the issue upon the map of the world, let us hope that paganism, bigotry, and superstition in Corea, and in all Asia, may disappear; and that in their places the religion of Jesus, science, education, and human brotherhood may find an abiding dwelling-place."

The work is finely gotten out, with numerous illustrations, a good map, an appendix and an index.

Christian Charity in the Ancient Church. By Dr. Gerhard Uhlhorn, Abbot of Loccum. Translated from the German with the Author's Sanction. pp. 424. 1883.

The object of the eminent author in this volume has been to set forth Christianity as having introduced a new law of love for mankind, and to trace the action and history of charity during the early centuries of the Church. He sets out with the condition of things before the coming of Christ as that of a world without love. Conceding that among the Greeks and Romans there was, indeed, even conspicuous liberality in giving money, he shows how thoroughly it was but the display of selfishness, utterly different from genuine charity. Even among the Jews, under the old dispensation, only the germs of love appeared. But in the example and cross of Christ there was the beginning and never-ending source of real charity among his followers. In this introduction of love came the new kingdom of heaven on earth. Over against polytheism, which divided mankind, Christianity unified men in the worship and service of one God. Part of serving God was love to men. He traces the beginnings of this charity in the apostolic Church, in the so-called community of goods, in the appointment of the seven, in the agapæ, the institution of deaconesses, in collections and entertainment of strangers. Upon the well-drawn background of the terribly prevalent poverty in the Roman empire, he shows the need of this new power of Christian love to open the race into a better life. Under the "first love" of the Church, this charity was developed and strengthened for the greater things it had afterwards to do in this way. The author gives a beautiful picture of the open-handedness of love in the

early Church. The offices and officials appointed for the management and direction of this service, according to the constitution and customs of the early days of Christianity, are pointed out. The obscurations of it after the time of Constantine are traced back to the influence of the teachings of Montanism. The history of the work of charity is followed on through the period of the decay of the Roman empire, presenting not only the methods of alms-giving, of congregational relief, the amelioration of the condition of slaves and the rescue of the oppressed, but the founding of hospitals, monasteries, and other agencies of mercy. The whole book, as we might expect from its learned author, is an admirable account of the nature, methods and deeds of early Christian charity. It is instructive, refreshing, and quickening, and deserves to be widely read.

Dr. Uhlhorn does not think that "the seven" of Acts vi. were the first deacons or that their selection was the institution of the diaconal office, as an office for the distribution of charity, besides that for the administration of the word. He is rather disposed to look upon the seven as specially appointed for a particular emergency, and to think that, when the apostles left Jerusalem, their office was gradually enlarged till it reached that of the elders, and was afterwards designated by this name.

The Scriptural Idea of Man. Six Lectures given before the Theological Students at Princeton, on the L. P. Stone Foundation. By Mark Hopkins, D. D. pp. 145. 1883.

The high reputation of Dr. Hopkins insures deserved attention for whatever he publishes. The subject of these lectures—the most of them having been given in substance to the students of the Theological Seminary at New Haven, and then at Chicago and Oberlin, before their delivery at Princeton—is one on which he is recognized as a specially competent authority. Though not meant as a reply to recent scientific speculations concerning the origin, place in nature, the character and destiny of man, the course of the discussion naturally involves these questions and forms a vindication of the Scripture view and teaching. This view is shown to be throughout rational, philosophical, and most worthy to be believed. These lectures could not but have been instructive and helpful to the theological students to whom they were delivered, and the author has done well to put them into this printed form for a wider service.

The following books have been received too late for review in this number:

SERMONS, PAMPHLETS, &C.

From B. Cheronny, Printer, Electrotyper and Bookbinder, 17 to 27 Vandewater St., New York, we have received a *Reproduction of the Original Manuscript* of the hymn "Ein feste Burg ist unser Gott" printed on card board, illuminated. It is taken from a manuscript collection of spiritual hymns used by Luther and published in 1530. It will be welcomed by the public as an interesting curiosity in this Anniversary Year of the Reformer.

Lutheran Literature: Distinctive traits and excellencies. By J. B. Reimensnyder, D. D. An address delivered before the Lutheran Publication Society at the meeting of the General Synod, convened at Springfield, O., May 21, 1883. This discourse which was received with so much applause at the time of its delivery has lost neither strength nor beauty by its appearance in print.

Probst, Diehl & Co., Allentown, Pa., send us: *Der Gang nach Worms* (The journey to Worms). Zum 400 jährigen Luther-Jubiläum. It gives in fifteen pages of sheet music the finale of the oratorio "Luther in Worms," by Ludwig Meinardus. The words are rendered into English by Mrs. Harriet Krauth Spæth. It is offered at the low rate of 35 cents, or \$3.00 per dozen. And a *Luther Memorial Service* for Sunday and Parochial Schools on the four hundredth anniversary of the birth of Dr. Martin Luther, Nov. 10, 1883. pp. 15.

MAGAZINES.

Blackwood, London Quarterly, British Quarterly, Westminster, and Edinburgh have been coming to hand from the Leonard Scott Publishing Company, 41 Barclay street, N. Y. They continue to be freighted with their usual variety of valuable and interesting matter.

Harpers' Publications—Magazine, Weekly, Bazar, Young People—not only maintain their high rank but are constantly improving.

The Grounds of Theistic and Christian Belief. By George P. Fisher, D. D. LL. D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Yale College. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.

Pauline Charity: Discourses on the Thirteenth Chapter of St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians. By the Rev. Jos. Cross, D. D. LL. D. Thos. Whittaker, New York.

Future Punishment From Parochial Sermons, with an Int. on the Scriptural Doctrine of Retribution and an Essay on Prayers for the dead. By Randolp H. McKim, D. D. The same.

Thoughts on the Lord's Prayer. By the Rev. Francis Washburn. The same.